DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 305 95 CE 007 413

AUTHOR Cronin, F. Patrick; And Others
TITLE Improving Vocational Education in Corrections: Proceedings of the Workshop for Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Manpower Training and Development.; Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Vocational Education.
REPORT NO VT-102-938
PUB DATE Jan 76
NOTE 186p.; Workshop held at the Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, October 28-31, 1975; Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility; For related document, see CE 007 414

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Education; *Corrective Institutions; *Program Descriptions; Program Improvement; *Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The 71 workshop participants represented vocational and correctional organizations from 41 States, Washington, D.C., and Canada. This report describes the background and proceedings of the workshop and contains the formal presentation papers. As an introduction, the history and background of the project are presented, and a brief description is provided of the preliminary information search and analysis activities, which included surveys of leaders, practitioners, and State agencies and a review and synthesis of the literature. The role of the planning committee is also briefly discussed. The four major topics addressed by the workshop were: how to develop the role of vocational education in correctional institutions, how to meet student needs, how to develop realistic programs, and how to develop cooperative approaches. Short summaries of the major presentations, along with the concerns and comments generated in the small group discussions appear in the report. Appended to the main body are the welcoming presentations, major workshop addresses, other selected addresses and reactions, a summary of the workshop program, lists of presenters and participants, and a bibliography (19 pages) of resources. (NJ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

Exhibit A

ED126305

IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

WORKSHOP FOR IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

COLUMBUS, OHIO
OCTOBER 28-31, 1975

THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
The Ohio State University • 1960 Kenny Road • Columbus, Ohio 43210

CE007413

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning and preparation. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

The material in this publication was funded by an Education Professional Development Act (EPDA), Part F, Section 553 Grant, administered through the Vocational Education Personnel Development Division, BOAE/USOE, Region V Office USOE, and the Division of Vocational Education of the Ohio State Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view do not, therefore, necessarily represent official BOAE, USOE, or State of Ohio position or policy.

Project funded under E.P.D.A., Part F, Section 553
by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of
the United States Office of Education, and
the Ohio State Board for Vocational
Education

IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKSHOP FOR IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

F. Patrick Cronin
Charles M. Whitson
Bruce A. Reinhart
L. Sue Keith

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

January 1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VT 102 930

The material in this publication was funded by an Education Professional Development Act (EPDA), Part F, Section 553 Grant, administered through the Vocational Education Personnel Development Division, BOAE/USOE, Region V Office USOE, and the Division of Vocational Education of the Ohio State Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view do not, therefore, necessarily represent official BOAE, USOE, or State of Ohio position or policy.

Project funded under E.P.D.A., Part F, Section 553
by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of
the United States Office of Education, and
the Ohio State Board for Vocational
Education

FOREWORD

More than a year ago, the staff at The Center for Vocational Education made a judgment, deliberately and explicitly, that vocational education in correctional institutions was a priority area which the national Center for Vocational Education should address. From October 28 to 31, 1975, seventy-one leaders and practitioners, concerned with educational programs in such settings, met at The Center in Columbus, Ohio, in a common effort to improve vocational education in correctional institutions.

The objectives of the four-day workshop and of this project were foundational. They included: (1) identification of the needs and concerns of correctional vocational educators, (2) the convening of a select planning committee to identify and prioritize these needs, and (3) conducting a workshop which would clarify the most urgent concerns and recommend potential solutions. These objectives were accomplished and undoubtedly will influence significant movements in vocational education in correctional institutions in the future.

During the workshop, presentations by leaders in criminal justice and education were followed by small discussions by the participants. The topics addressed such questions as: how do we develop the role of vocational education in corrections; how do we meet the needs of students; how do we develop realistic programs; how do we develop cooperative approaches to vocational education in corrections; and what are the roles of the U. S. Office of Education, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the U. S. Department of Labor with regard to vocational education in correctional settings? This publication contains the formal presentation papers as they related to these various key questions.

We wish to thank the workshop participants for their active and meaningful participation. Special appreciation is extended to the select Planning Committee for their assistance in guiding the development of the program and to D. R. Purkey for his invaluable contributions to the development of the project. The following Center staff are also recognized for their contributions to this project: Bruce Reinhart, Associate Director, Personnel Development Division; F. Patrick Cronin, Project Director; Charles Whitson, Research Specialist; L. Sue Keith, Graduate Research Associate; Carlene Tondryk, Resource Evaluator; and secretaries Mary Bolden and Vicki Volpe.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

THE PROBLEM AND THE PROJECT. 1

THE INFORMATION SEARCH AND ANALYSIS. 4

Survey of Leaders and Practitioners. 4

Survey of State Agencies 8

Review and Synthesis of Literature 10

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 13

THE WORKSHOP 16

Description of Participants. 17

Discussion Outcomes. 17

Topic 1: How Do We Develop the Role of Vocational Education in Corrections?. 18

Topic 2: How Do We Meet the Needs of Students?. 22

Topic 3: How Do We Develop Realistic Programs?. 24

Topic 4: How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches to Vocational Education in Corrections?. 30

Summarizing the Workshop 32

THE PLAN OF ACTION 32

Research 32

Personnel Development. 33

Program Development. 33

Cooperation. 33

APPENDICES 35

Appendix A--Welcoming Presentations. 35

Appendix B--Summary of Workshop Program. 47

Appendix C--Participants and Presenters. 53

Appendix D--Workshop Major Addresses 61

Appendix E--Selected Workshop Presentations and Reactions. 91

Appendix F--Bibliography of Documents Related to Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions. 175

THE PROBLEM AND THE PROJECT

As the expansion and improvement of vocational education in the "free world" has developed into a high priority nationwide, the development of more and better vocational education in correctional institutions has languished. In contrast to vocational education in the public schools, vocational education in correctional institutions has not benefited from the same level of commitment, institutional support, professional interest, and technical assistance. It has lacked visibility both within the criminal justice system and within the vocational education profession.

Nevertheless, an awareness of the status of vocational education within correctional institutions has been developing. There have been or are currently studies of correctional vocational education in at least nine states (Arkansas, California, Delaware, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Washington) and in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In addition, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals released a landmark report to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration that challenged correctional educators to design vocational programs based upon a "determination of needs, establishment of program objectives, and assimilation into the labor market."[1]

As an outcome of these and other observations of vocational education in correctional institutions, it is being acknowledged that vocational education programs are being compromised: criminal offenders are being returned

---

[1]National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, January 1973), pp. 368-371.

to society without marketable skills that could help them make a satisfactory adjustment to society. Furthermore, vocational educators within correctional institutions are often marginal persons within these institutions and within their profession. Finally, some of their needs are being recognized.

Consequently, it was the purpose of this project to expand this growing awareness; identify the major needs and problems; bring concerned, knowledgeable, decision-makers together; and develop a plan for the improvement of vocational education in corrections. In addition, it was hoped that in exploring the problems and their potential solutions the workshop participants would develop a commitment to the improvement of vocational education in whatever environment they work.

This situation suggested three basic questions. First, where are we? This question asks for a status report of vocational education in corrections that provides additional information about the perceived problems. The answer to this question provides the base for the next question, where do we go from here? Goals and objectives are not very clearly defined for correctional operations. This question begins to approach this issue. Finally, how do we get there? This question calls for a plan of action and related strategies.

These three basic questions provided the general approach to the project objectives. The specific objectives were as follows:

(1) identify and clarify the major needs and concerns of leaders and practitioners in correctional institutions by a telephone interview survey;

(2) identify and clarify the major needs and concerns of vocational educators in corrections as revealed by contemporary authors in a survey of publication abstracts;

(3) convene a representative, expert, planning committee to identify other needs, to prioritize the correctional vocational educator's needs (including those revealed by the surveys), and to assist in developing an agenda for a four-day workshop;

(4) conduct a workshop for a selected group of participants that would

(a) identify other needs and concerns of vocational educators in corrections, explore alternative problem solutions, and specify potential resources;

(b) allow exchange of perceptions about the state-of-the-art of vocational education in correctional institutions;

(c) emphasize participatory interaction among the participants--designed to allow communication between interdependent agencies, orginizations, professional associations, advisory councils, and professional associations, advisory councils, and professional leaders and designed to obtain consensus on difficult problem solutions; and

(d) develop a plan of action, making specific recommendations for improving vocational education in correctional institutions;

(5) disseminate the proceedings of the workshop in both abbreviated and comprehensive documents; and

(6) submit a final report to the U. S. Office of Education, following the requested format, which makes recommendations for future action.

It should be kept in mind that this project was not intended to be a substitute for a sound, systematic research of the problems of vocational education in correctional institutions. It was a relatively low budget project that provided for an overview of the related literature and opinions of leaders

in the field as a basis for the development of a workshop to give knowledgeable persons the opportunity to discuss problems and issues and make recommendations for the improvement of vocational education in corrections. For instance, the workshop participants expressed many assumptions, philosophies, observations, opinions, and conclusions that could not be tested. In fact, there are numerous inconsistencies in their observations and recommendations that are a part of this report. Nevertheless, they did call for a research foundation for vocational education in corrections that could more adequately provide future guidance.

THE INFORMATION SEARCH AND ANALYSIS

To identify the most important needs and concerns of vocational educators in correctional institutions, three data-gathering steps were necessary. In the first step, leaders and practitioners in correctional vocational education were asked to view their concerns through a nationwide telephone survey. Second, state criminal justice planning agencies, manpower planning councils, and state departments of education were surveyed by mail in an effort to gauge their commitments to correctional vocational education. In a final effort, document abstracts and documents relating to vocational education in corrections were reviewed.

Survey of Leaders and Practitioners

From July 15 to August 1, 1975, telephone interviews were held with 49 persons throughout the United States. The respondents were state directors of vocational education, state directors of corrections, institutional supervisors of education, vocational education supervisors, treatment directors,

state "special needs" personnel, and directors of correctional education.

Specifically, they were asked (1) to describe the status of vocational education in corrections (as they perceived it), (2) to describe improvements which they felt needed to be implemented, and (3) to identify barriers which prevented or slowed the implementation of improvements. Their responses were categorized into five basic areas: instruction, professional development, local administration, state administration, and general concerns, as follows:

Instruction

1. Student selection procedures need to be improved.
2. More adequate systems for assessing the needs and interests of inmates need to be devised.
3. Educators need to know how to motivate the incarcerated learner.
4. Conflicting demands on the inmate's time, by educators and by corrections personnel, need to be resolved.
5. Students need realistic educational experiences--"live" work rather than simulated work and realistic facilities rather than antiquated ones.
6. Instructional materials need to be "inmate" centered. Correctional vocational educators frequently have short-term students who enter and leave at varying times. Program offerings, therefore, must be structured flexibly.
7. Students completing vocational education programs in prisons should be allowed to use those skills in the prison after training, if possible. "Long-termers" are often prevented, because of sentence length, from participating in vocational education programs.
8. Vocational educators are sometimes asked to train students for prison

industries' needs rather than for the student's needs; the education and production emphases often conflict.

Professional Development

1. Improved programs of staff development are needed to update teacher skills.
2. Teacher turnover is too high for good program development.
3. The educator's role in corrections needs to be made clear; it sometimes conflicts with the "security" role.
4. Vocational teachers, whether in free world or correctional programs, should meet the same quality standards.
5. Procedures for evaluation of teaching and administrative personnel need to be devised.
6. Educators need to investigate the possible use of non-professionals to improve the learning environment.
7. Traditionally-trained teachers are not always adequately prepared to work in a correctional setting.

Local Administration

1. Correctional vocational educators need assistance in their program planning. Educational administrators in corrections and the free world need to work together to assist the correctional educator in identifying resources and designing programs.
2. Advisory committees should be used in program planning.
3. Philosophical conflicts in corrections sometimes result in incongruent situations for educators and custodial officers. Educators and custodial officers should work cooperatively to minimize interference between them.

4. Educators need more relevant information about the job market. They need to participate in the post-release job placement of ex-convicts. They need follow-up information on their students.
5. The disparity of the salaries of correctional and "free world" teachers needs to be resolved.
6. Models need to be developed for the evaluation of vocational education programs in corrections.

State Administration

1. State administrators lack knowledge of the needs of correctional vocational education.
2. Financial resources for correctional vocational education are inadequate. This may reflect a lack of commitment among funding agencies toward correctional education.
3. Vocational educators are concerned about legislative restrictions which affect the funding and job placement of students.
4. Articulation of educational credits from correctional educational programs to those in the "free world" needs to be improved.
5. Correctional vocational education can profit by increased inter-agency cooperation.
6. Improved evaluative data are needed to make administrative decisions.
7. Labor union involvement in correctional programs needs to be strengthened.

General Concerns

1. At state and national levels, inter-agency cooperation and commitment for improving correctional vocational education are lacking.
2. Public sentiment for progressive rehabilitation efforts is often

negative.

3. A rehabilitative educational model should include community involvement.

4. Correctional vocational education needs a center for national leadership.

5. Correctional vocational education should be a priority concern of state and federal agencies.

6. Vocational education standards need to be established for corrections.

Survey of State Agencies

Planning documents were requested from agencies of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, manpower/CETA programs, and state departments of education. These agencies in each state and the District of Columbia were asked to submit a copy of their state plan for review. Response rates are reported in Table 1.

Of the 51 LEAA state planning agencies contacted, 26 responded. Fifteen indicated a specific monetary commitment to correctional vocational education; eight SPAs made no specific monetary commitment, but they did mention vocational education programs. Only three failed to mention projects in correctional vocational education.

Twenty-nine of the 51 CETA representatives responded to the informational request. Thirteen specifically listed correctional vocational education expenditures. While seven others did not have monies set aside, they indicated that projects for correctional vocational education had been developed. Nine of the 29 responses had no specific description of monies being spent for correctional vocational education.

TABLE 1

Financial Commitment by State Agencies to Occupational Programs in Corrections as Reflected in State Planning Documents *

Level of Response	State Departments of Education	Manpower/ CETA Planning Agencies	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
No specific mention	4	9	3
No specific mention but programs described	22	7	8
Specific commitment stated	7	13	15

*Of the 51 agencies contacted in each category, 33 state departments of education responded (64%), 29 manpower planning agencies responded (56%), and 26 LEAA agencies responded (50%).

Of the 51 state departments of education contacted, 33 responded with copies of their plans. While seven specifically described expenditures, 22 made no monetary commitment to corrections in their state plans. However, these 22 did mention programs in progress in their state. Only four of the state departments of education made no mention of vocational education in corrections.

Generally, the agencies responding revealed little specific commitment to correctional vocational education in state planning documents. These findings seemed to be confirmed by a survey of expenditures on vocational education for offenders conducted in July, 1975, by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U. S. Office of Education. This document, entitled "Survey of Funds Encumbered or Expended in Fiscal Year 1973 under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended for Programs Serving Persons in Adult and Juvenile Correctional Institutions," reveals that 15 states spent no state and local vocational education funds in fiscal year 1973.

Review and Synthesis of Literature

Another effort to identify problems and issues of vocational education in correctional institutions was the review of documents and document abstracts from 1970 to early 1975 through the use of mechanized information systems. The following four information systems were used because of their high potential in this area: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), National Technical Information Service (NTIS), National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), and Abstracts of Instructional Materials--Abstracts of Research Materials in Vocational Education (AIM/ARM). Two hundred and twenty-seven documents were selected for review from the 1,048 documents identified. The

concerns expressed by the authors and the number of documents expressing those concerns are outlined below.

I. Educational Alternatives in Corrections (25 documents)
   A. Community Resources
   B. Community-Based Programs
   C. Study Release Programs

II. Public Awareness of Correctional Vocational Education (8 documents)
   A. The Role of Businessmen and Labor Unions in Corrections
   B. The Prison Stereotype
   C. Public Attitudes Toward Corrections

III. Student Assessment and Motivation (26 documents)
   A. Physical and Mental Handicaps--Assessment
   B. Cultural Differences of Inmates
   C. Recruitment of Inmates for Vocational Education
   D. Modification of Inmates' Attitudes in the Vocational Education Class
   E. Motivation for Learning
   F. Improvement of Prisoner Self-Concept

IV. Improving Attitudes of the Incarcerated (8 documents)

V. Instructional Concerns (23 documents)
   A. Innovative Techniques in the Prison Classroom
   B. Variety of Teaching Styles
   C. New Educational Delivery Systems
   D. Barriers to Training

VI. Curriculum Development (23 documents)
   A. Selection of Training Areas

B. Sources of Funding

C. Division-wide Program Development

D. Special Needs for Minorities

E. Career Education

VII. Post-Release Problems (29 documents)

A. Services Needed by the Ex-Offender

B. Legislative Employment Barriers

C. Attitudinal Employment Barriers

D. Student Follow-up Needs

VIII. Evaluation of Programs (23 documents)

A. Impact of Programs

B. Delineation of Resources

1. Funding

2. Personnel

C. System Operation

D. System Evaluation

IX. Personnel Development (20 documents)

A. Staff Development

B. Teacher Development

C. Offender Development

X. Philosophy of Penal Reform (17 documents)

A. State of the Art

B. Prison of the Future

C. Identification of Needs of Corrections

D. Sources of Conflict (e.g., Custody or Rehabilitation)

E. Impediments to Penal Reform

XI. Inter-Agency Cooperation (1 document)

XII. Legislative Concerns (9 documents)

A. Employment of Ex-Offenders

B. Evaluation of MDTA

C. Role of Special Groups in Pushing for Legislation

XIII. Uncategorized Literature (25 documents)

A. Conference Proceedings

B. Descriptions of the State-of-the-Art

C. Research Studies

D. Bibliographies

The bibliography of these and other documents, presented in Appendix F and their analysis were provided for the reference of both the Planning Committee and the workshop participants.

The concerns most frequently reported by the writers involved educational alternatives in corrections, student assessment and motivation, instructional concerns, curriculum development, post-release problems, evaluation of programs, and personnel development. These concerns parallel those expressed by leaders/practitioners in the telephone survey.

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Planning Committee had a very important role to play in assuring the success of the workshop. The Committee was asked to:

1. provide consultation on workshop goals on the basis of their personal expertise and with the aid of the information surveys;

2. recommend the workshop agenda;

3. identify personnel and material resources;

4. identify and assist in the development of communication channels; and

5. identify criteria for the selection of workshop participants and recommend individual participants.

The Planning Committee consisted of a diverse group of distinguished leaders and experts from both education and corrections. Members of the Planning Committee were:

Lawrence M. Aber
Vocational Education Supervisor, Missouri Division of Corrections

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director, American Vocational Association

Sherman Day
Director, National Institute of Corrections

Donald A. Deppe
Education Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons

E. E. Hilfiker
Education Coordinator, Oregon State Correctional Institution

Elayn Hunt
Director, Louisiana Department of Corrections

Max L. Lerner
Vice Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents

Ronald G. Tarlaian
Program Specialist, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, USOE

Alfons F. Maresh
Director of Education, Minnesota Department of Corrections

Reginald Petty
Executive Director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director, American Correctional Association

Francis T. Tuttle
State Director of Vocational Education, Oklahoma Dept. of Education

The Planning Committee met on August 14-15, 1975, in Louisville, Kentucky, to discharge their responsibilities. The resulting agenda of the workshop is found in Appendix B. Most of their deliberations, however, were later focused upon identifying and describing four general areas of concern for vocational education upon which the workshop could be based. Those areas and some of the related questions are identified below.

The first area was: How do we develop the role of vocational education in correctional institutions? Some of the related questions were: What is unique about vocational education in correctional institutions? What does vocational education in correctional institutions have in common with all vocational education? What are the expected outcomes of vocational education in correctional institutions? What are the philosophical foundations (e.g., rehabilitation) that provide the rationale for vocational education? How can the philosophies and programs of vocational education be reconciled with other correctional programs such as prison industries and prison maintenance? What kind of environment is required to support a satisfactory role for vocational education in correctional institutions? What should be the relationship between vocational education in institutions and in the free world?

The second area was: How do we meet the needs of students? Some of the related questions were: How can we better identify the needs of the students? By whom should the diagnosis of student needs be made? How do we meet the needs of different types of students--male and female, short-termers and long-termers, minimum security inmates and maximum security inmates, etc.? What alternative approaches are necessary to meet the variety of needs? How can the students' needs be met after their release?

The third area was: How do we develop effective programs in correctional

vocational education? How can vocational education programs be made more responsive to the labor market in the free world? How can we provide experiential programs with incarcerated students? How can we build positive student attitudes toward the world of work? What are the alternative delivery systems and which systems ought to be further developed? How do we improve program (formative) evaluation? How do we determine the impact (summative evaluation) of vocational education programs? How do we meet the programmatic needs of all students, including women who make up such a small number of the total population, with scarce resources? What policies have to be changed in order to develop effective programs? How do we develop the personnel to provide the programs?

The first major concern of the Planning Committee was: How do we develop cooperative approaches to vocational education in corrections? What ought to be the role of diverse groups in supporting vocational education in correctional institutions? How can the coordination of the diverse groups be accomplished to improve the vocational education of inmates? How can we coordinate vocational education with other services within the institution? How can legislation help effect the improvement of vocational education in correctional institutions?

THE WORKSHOP

At the workshop held on October 28-31, 1975, 71 selected participants met at The Center for Vocational Education to focus their attention on improving vocational education in correctional institutions. The participants represented vocational education and correctional organizations from 41

different states, the District of Columbia, and Canada. The names of the participants are listed in Appendix C.

Description of Participants

Those invited to attend the workshop included persons from the educational and criminal justice fields, as well as from private, public, and professional interest groups.

Corrections personnel represented state correctional institutions, state departments of corrections, The American Correctional Association, The National Institute of Corrections, The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, The Federal Bureau of Prisons, supervisors and directors of correctional education programs, and former inmates.

Leaders in education represented The American Vocational Association, The National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, The U. S. Office of Education (Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education), the National Institute of Education, the Department of Labor, educational institutions (free world and correctional), state departments of education, state advisory councils, state boards of regents, educational research centers, and supervisors and directors of vocational education.

Finally, private and public service groups that provide financial and social support to correctional programs were also represented. Two of these organizations were the National Alliance of Businessmen and the AFL/CIO.

Discussion Outcomes

Small group discussions followed presentations by leaders in each of the four topical areas. In general, the presenters elaborated upon the significance of the topic and called attention to the problems, issues, and solutions

that were associated with it. These presentations stimulated the discussions and provided information and points-of-view for consideration by the small group participants.

Each topic elicited a number of concerns and a variety of suggestions for their resolution. Although the small group discussions were extensive and sometimes heated, the resulting concerns and related suggestions are not complete. In fact, they are sometimes redundant, illogical, and conflicting. This is to be expected when more than 70 people get together to discuss any social problem. Yet, no concern or suggestion is reported here that did not have considerable support. The concerns and comments of the small group participants, together with a summary of the related presentations, are reported below.

Topic I

How Do We Develop the Role of Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions?

Sherwood Dees, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Vocational Education in Illinois, approached this topic with an address that described how Illinois corrections agencies developed vocational education with the help of the State Department of Education. Dees emphasized the need for cooperation among concerned agencies and individuals in the state; described the State Division of Vocational and Technical Education as being supportive in planning, operating, funding, evaluating, and coordinating vocational education programs in corrections; reviewed Illinois' model of educational evaluation; and emphasized the commitment in the Division to help correctional institutions.

The workshop participants responded to this topic with a number of related concerns and objectives.

Concern #1 - Parameters of vocational education in corrections. The participants were concerned about the current parameters of vocational education in corrections and raised a number of questions about how they could be changed. For instance, they asked: What institutional philosophies are needed to make the goals of education and the institution congruent? and How can we bring the statutes, priorities, and objectives that supposedly hinder efforts of cooperation into harmony within the institutions and without the institutions? Their suggestions were as follows:

1. Describe the mission and philosophy of vocational education in both adult and juvenile correctional programs.
2. Define a philosophy of vocational education that will integrate vocational education into the entire criminal justice system, including security and maintenance.
3. Obtain a specific commitment to correctional vocational education in legislation.
4. Develop correctional vocational programs of equal or better quality than free-world programs.
5. Coordinate the services of departments within the institutions to provide the diverse support needed (e.g., basic education, medical services, etc.) by students.
6. Request professional organizations to publicly recognize and support correctional education.
7. Promote vocational education in corrections as a distinct professional entity.

8. Explore intra-system articulation involving all agencies of the criminal justice system (e.g., courts, corrections, parole, probation, etc.).

9. Open training programs within institutions to free world students.

Concern #2 - Inmate career development. The participants viewed vocational education as a part of the career development of the inmates. This concern was best revealed in the question, How do vocational education programs reflect the trainees' needs for orientation to work and exploration of career options, as well as job training? Their suggestions were as follows:

1. Develop a model for career education in corrections.
2. Develop programs that complement the total career development of the inmate.
3. Create vocational programs that include work habits and attitudes, related academic subjects, and skills training in a unified approach.
4. Establish pre-vocational programs that allow students to explore their interests and aptitudes.
5. Establish occupational resource centers for the development of career awareness.
6. Introduce diagnostic testing of students that places an emphasis upon career guidance.
7. Integrate vocational training with prison industries and work release.

Concern #3 - Inmate needs for academic education. The workshop participants also acknowledged the interrelationship of vocational and academic education. They asked: Can the curricular objectives of academic and vocational education be coordinated? How can correctional vocational educators prevent

the fragmentation of instruction that occurs so often in free world schools? What alternatives to the current instructional delivery systems exist to foster a stronger interrelationship? Their suggestions were as follows:

1. Provide incarcerated individuals with "living skills" as well as marketable skills.
2. Utilize advisory committees to assist in the identification of alternative delivery systems and vocational program characteristics.
3. Design instructional materials and methodologies for open entry-open exit educational systems.
4. Emphasize flexibility in program development.
5. Concentrate more curriculum development on the students that lack general education skills.
6. Evaluate alternative instructional delivery systems.
7. Establish a national clearinghouse for the diffusion of vocational education programs and materials for corrections.

Concern #4 - Public acceptance of vocational education in corrections.

The workshop participants were deeply concerned about the image of vocational education both within the institutions and by the public and wanted to improve this image. Consequently, they made the following suggestions:

1. Establish an ongoing public relations program that emphasizes community involvement.
2. Open institutions, where possible, to the general public.
3. Involve non-educational instructional staff in vocational programs.
4. Develop more correctional educational programs that take place in the free world.
5. Maintain high quality vocational programs that elicit the respect

of participants and observers.

Topic 2

How Do We Meet the Needs of Students?

William E. Monroe, Euphesenia Foster, Sherman Day, and Ruth M. Glick described their perceptions of this important topic. Monroe, a vocational coordinator in the Windham School District (Texas), said flatly that vocational educators had failed. His major concerns included (1) the need for a definition of vocational education in corrections, (2) the problem of motivating incarcerated students, (3) the need for personal involvement with incarcerated students, (4) the recognition and understanding of the convict subculture, (5) the need for unbiased tests to diagnose inmates' problems, (6) the lack within the vocational curricula of the affective competencies that students need, and (7) the need for post-release support for students.

Euphesenia Foster, who is assigned from the Federal Bureau of Prisons to coordinate women offender activities for the Department of Labor during International Women's Year, focused on the unmet needs of women offenders in correctional institutions. Her major points were (1) the institution often meets its needs rather than those of the students, (2) vocational programs must deal with the whole person, (3) the contemporary offender usually comes from a very different sector of society than the contemporary custodial officers--thus creating frustrating institutions, (4) the needs of the students and institutional policy often lack congruence, and (5) the correctional student must realize his responsibility for success after "commencement."

Ruth Glick, Director of the National Study on Women's Correctional Programs for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, emphasized the need

for diverse, quality programs for women. She described several concerns including the stereotypes for women's programs, the differences in promotional possibilities for women and men, the special needs of women trainees, and the need to eliminate sex bias in vocational programming.

The workshop participants responded to this topic and the addresses with a number of related concerns and objectives.

Concern #1 - Determine student needs. The workshop participants expressed a concern for the determination of student needs. For instance, they asked, How can the determination of needs best be accomplished? They also were concerned about the determination of student needs as described by the correctional institution and by the inmate sub-culture and wondered how these could be resolved. Their suggestions were as follows:

1. Develop more comprehensive diagnostic models.
2. Develop bias- and culture-free diagnostic tests.
3. Place inmates on program advisory committees to obtain their input.

Concern #2 - Acknowledge student needs. The participants were also concerned about responding appropriately to the needs of the inmates. This was expressed in such questions as: How can correctional vocational educators best respond to the needs of students? When should students be offered vocational education in correctional institutions? How can incarcerated inmates be motivated? They answered as follows:

1. Offer a wider range of vocational education programs to meet student needs.
2. Make vocational education programs more realistic and humanizing.
3. Use more of the available resources for meeting student needs.
4. Emphasize program flexibility to better respond to student needs.

5. Increase vocational education efforts when inmates are approaching release.
6. Involve the students in program development.
7. Provide "prime" time for vocational programs.
8. Expand the teacher's role to include career guidance.
9. Allow students to experience success as frequently as possible to increase motivation.
10. Provide more "live" work experiences rather than contrived experiences.
11. Individualize the instructional system to allow the student to complete units of the program more frequently.
12. Systematically develop the credibility of vocational programs with parole boards.

Concern #3 - Evaluate efforts to meet student needs. The participants were also concerned about the evaluation of student needs. They acknowledged that this would include a more precise determination of evaluative criteria. Consequently, they recommended the following:

1. Identify research criteria to judge success or failure of the programs to meet student needs.
2. Conduct evaluation studies, especially follow-up studies.

Topic 3

How Do We Develop Realistic Programs in Correctional Vocational Education?

Amos Reed, Francis Tuttle, Anthony Travisono, and Ralph Bregman contributed their points of view prior to the participants' discussions of this

topic. According to Amos Reed, the Administrator of the Oregon Corrections Division, the "three R's" must be resocialization, reintegration, and rehabilitation. Reed also emphasized the need to help the total student with a closely interrelated approach to student needs, wants, abilities, and potentials. This interrelationship also included vocational education and all other rehabilitative programs. He stated that a comprehensive program of career education included career awareness, career exploration, skill development, placement, and follow-up. He also called for more involvement with free world industry, public, and proprietary educational programs.

In addition, Reed claimed that lack of money, facilities, equipment, good training plans, and accurate information about the labor market have kept correctional institutions from offering realistic programs.

In another approach, Francis Tuttle, Director of the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education in Oklahoma, indicated that the goal of vocational programs--which traditionally allows the inmate to learn a saleable skill--should be broadened. Tuttle described a process of vocational education that includes assessment of students' skills and interests, development and maintenance of employment and training resources, instruction in job selection and application, student progress assessment, and counseling during job placement.

Tuttle suggested nine ways through which realistic programs could be developed:

1. Provide opportunities that would help the student master the basic skills of reading, communication, and problem solving.
2. Provide an environment that would help students develop a positive attitude toward learning.

3. Foster a feeling of adequacy and self-worth on the part of each student.
4. Provide opportunities for students to express the full extent of their creativity.
5. Provide experiences which help students adapt to a world of change.
6. Help students acquire and demonstrate an appreciation for and positive attitudes toward persons and cultures different from their own.
7. Help every student receive an opportunity to train for the world of work.
8. Provide experiences that will enable students to cope with the barriers and fears expressed by society towards them.
9. Provide on-the-job follow-up to make sure that the enrollee is progressing satisfactorily, that no related problems are hindering his progress, and that the employer is satisfied with his performance.

Anthony Travisono, Executive Director of the American Corrections Association, responded to this topic by saying that vocational education has received only token acceptance in corrections. He suggested that the lack of acceptance resulted from the high cost of vocational education programs. Travisono rejected the supposed exclusiveness of the punishment and the treatment approaches. He indicated that some of both approaches to rehabilitation may be necessary. Finally, he described correctional education as the weakest link in the correctional continuum--the educational concern should begin the moment we begin to train the inmate and continue when the inmate takes a job in the free world.

Ralph Bregman of the University of California at Los Angeles presented four key ideas. First, he suggested that vocational education is an

alternative to narrower vocational training; second, he described vocational education as a tool for easing the socialization process of inducting an immature person into the free world; third, inmates may well be demanding quality educational programs as their right; and finally, he asserted that the nation is on the brink of a social movement which will allow needed social change.

The workshop participants expressed a number of concerns and recommendations for the development of realistic programs.

Concern #1 - Uniqueness of vocational education programs in corrections. The participants felt that there were some unique situations that influenced vocational education in corrections. They expressed concerns about how these uniquenesses could be accommodated in the development of realistic programs. Their recommendations were as follows:

1. Provide correctional teachers with both pre-service and in-service training for the corrections environment.
2. Acknowledge the cost of adequate facilities for vocational programs and provide for them.
3. Identify and seek outside sources for additional resources, e.g., industries, public agencies, chambers of commerce, etc.
4. Use advisory committees to help determine realistic program characteristics.

Concern #2 - Personnel development. The participants expressed a concern about the way instructors influence program outcomes. In other words, if the programs are to be realistic the instructors must also be realistic. Their suggestions for maintaining a realistic staff are as follows:

1. Screen staff carefully at the time of recruitment to eliminate inappropriate staff.

2. Make periodic evaluations of staff development needs.
3. Develop teacher education materials that are customized for corrections and disseminate them through a national clearinghouse.
4. Offer pre-service and in-service training for instructors of inmates both inside and outside of the institution.
5. Provide in-service training for the cognitive and affective domains as well as for the manipulative domain.
6. Instill in teachers an awareness of the reality of incarceration.
7. Increase external associations with industrial and educational personnel.

Concern #3 - Instructional methodology. The participants were concerned about the relationship of instructional methodology to realistic program offerings. They offered the following suggestions:

1. Develop more alternative delivery systems.
2. Expand educational release programs.
3. Provide more individualization of instruction.
4. Employ a greater variety of instructional strategies.
5. Develop a clearinghouse for the dissemination of instructional methodologies, resources, curricula, and evaluation instruments.
6. Utilize more community-based options for instructional delivery systems.
7. Employ more evaluation of programs, personnel, and resources.
8. Place greater emphasis upon interpersonal relationships between instructor and student.
9. Identify and use supportive services.

Concern #4 - Job relatedness. The participants were concerned about the job relatedness of programs and suggested the following:

1. Relate student interests to labor market opportunities.
2. Increase the number of pre-apprenticeship programs.
3. Relate vocational education jobs with employability in prison industries.
4. Develop programs that allow students to build upon their interests and capabilities.
5. Develop a pilot program to simulate an external living environment complete with a token economy.
6. Establish programmatic criteria that are broader than job placement.
7. Involve students in program planning.
8. Work to reduce the number of restrictions (licensing, etc.) in obtaining jobs for inmates.
9. Work with apprenticeship committees to improve job opportunities.
10. Establish linkages with licensing boards.
11. Hire job developers (possibly ex-cons) to find jobs.
12. Gear training to a particular employer or a particular job with a cooperating employer.
13. Encourage correctional vocational educators to participate in trade associations.
14. Keep programs responsive to labor market demands.
15. Establish employment coordination with community and manpower agencies.

Topic 4

How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches to Vocational Education in Corrections?

Three leaders in diverse professional roles presented their concerns about developing cooperative approaches. The State Director of the Division of Vocational Education in Ohio, Byrl R. Shoemaker, said that vocational education programs in correctional institutions were too few and too mediocre. He stated that lack of cooperative support was one of the reasons, and he gave several examples of how cooperation among Ohio agencies has been beneficial to vocational education in correctional institutions.

Nevertheless, he stated that it would take "line item" funding for correctional institutions to adequately provide for these programs. He also stated that the creation of formal documents of agreement should be developed to identify and describe shared responsibilities.

As an administrator, Shoemaker wants to spend his state's money on programs that really make a difference. He challenged researchers to identify such programs and to base their value in terms of resulting job skills, and not solely on the basis of recidivism rates.

Sylvia McCollum, Educational Specialist for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, described three communities in which cooperation must increase if effective vocational education is to be developed, and made a number of generalizations. In the educational community, impediments to cooperation exist because of the lack of transferable course credits, the lack of free world understanding and involvement in correctional education, and the lack of educational opportunities for ex-offenders. In the correctional community, McCollum suggested that education's low priority is the general cause of its lack of development.

Finally, she stated that cooperation must be cultivated among public and private agencies concerned about correctional education programs.

In summary, McCollum stated that cooperation can be cultivated by (1) thinking positively about meeting the vocational education needs, (2) understanding and respecting the special problems of the inmates, (3) obtaining the support of all parties in setting aside inmate time and prison facilities for vocational education, and (4) developing post-release relationships with the ex-offender.

In the final presentation on this topic, John Armore described the National Alliance of Businessmen's role in developing opportunities for ex-offenders. The NAB has been attempting to reduce the waste of natural and financial resources in correctional institutions. Armore said the wall--keeping inmates in and the public out--must come down. In addition, more attention must be given to the motivation of the incarcerated.

Concern #1 - Strategies for developing cooperation. The workshop participants quickly agreed upon the necessity of increasing cooperative approaches and were primarily concerned about how to effect more of them. Consequently, they were concerned with: How can budget limitations and leadership vacuums be filled and a new national direction of correctional vocational education be established? Who will take the initiative in gaining a total commitment for vocational education in corrections? How can responsibility be clearly delineated for various agencies? Their responses were as follows:

1. Establish an inter-agency council to explore problems and issues related to correctional vocational education.
2. Formally specify the responsibilities of related agencies for vocational education in corrections.

3. Identify legislative changes that would facilitate cooperative arrangements.
4. Explore supportive legislation that would allow private industry to establish business operations with institutions as a defined adjunct to vocational education.
5. Require state and regional planning agencies (including the departments of education, Comprehensive Employment Training Act and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, etc.) to develop realistic plans for supporting vocational education in corrections.

Summarizing the Workshop

With this task behind them, the participants attempted to combine and reduce their major recommendations to categorical, prioritized listings. This would constitute their "plan" for the improvement of vocational education in corrections. The following section reports the results of this effort.

THE PLAN OF ACTION

The final results of the workshop were categorized into four major divisions and stated in the form of recommendations. Each categorized list is presented in the order of importance established by the workshop participants.

Research

1. Determine methods of assessing needs of incarcerated students for vocational and career education.
2. Assess alternative delivery systems for vocational education and evaluate their effectiveness.
3. Establish standards for programs and develop evaluative criteria.

4. Analyze sources of support for correctional vocational education and develop the framework for inter-agency cooperation.

Personnel Development

1. Develop a training model for instructors, including in-service and pre-service components, based upon a "student needs" approach.
2. Establish standards for teacher recruitment and selection.
3. Develop teacher education materials specifically for vocational instructors in corrections.
4. Develop a national public education program to improve the public image of vocational education in correctional institutions.

Program Improvement

1. Establish a national clearinghouse for correctional education that will provide information and resources for the improvement of education in corrections.
2. Establish accreditation standards and evaluation criteria consistent with free world programs.
3. Assess relevance and applicability of available curriculum materials.
4. Develop a career education program for incarcerates.
5. Prepare student-centered models for program development.

Cooperation

1. Develop and implement standards for use of community advisory committees for vocational education in corrections.
2. Establish national and state inter-agency councils/commissions for program review and evaluation.
3. Require regional, state, and local planning documents to specify commitments to vocational education in corrections.

4. Develop industry/education cooperative vocational training within the institutions.
5. Establish a national advisory task force to encourage community involvement in correctional vocational education.

These recommendations are listed in the order of national priority as decided by the workshop. State and local priorities did not differ materially from this order. As stated, some recommendations may be acted upon at all levels of effort.

In summary, the Workshop for Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions may well become what more than one speaker alluded to--a significant event in history. The amount of interest that was created, the importance of the dialogue that occurred, and the expectation of the improvement that will be accomplished has mad- this plan of action the most important postulate in the history of vocational education in corrections.

APPENDIX A

WELCOMING PRESENTATIONS

These addresses were presented at the Workshop to Improve Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions at The Center for Vocational Education of The Ohio State University, October 28-31, 1975. They received limited editing by the project staff.

"Welcome to Ohio"

Byrl R. Shoemaker, Director
Ohio Division of Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

It is good to welcome a historical conference to the State of Ohio. What you are talking about today is not a popular topic. As I see it, it is something in the future. During this conference, you are going to hear from some very fine people who are on the cutting edge. Until groups of this type come together and begin to discuss the issues and methodology, its time will not come.

There have been some studies concerning vocational education in the field of corrections. We participated and invested in one; I am sure other states have also. There has been an identification of needs; there has been an identification of some solutions; but is there a readiness to make a significant investment to expand vocational education in the correctional institutions? I doubt if there is an economic readiness for a significant investment. In our state we are merely toying with it. We are building relationships and identifying needs, but it is still not enough. All that does is salve our conscience.

Vocational education in correctional institutions is not a movement yet; I believe some leaders, from such states as Illinois (and my good friend Sherwood Dees is here), will be sharing with you some of their efforts. Texas, Ohio and some other states have begun to open doors, have begun to identify how to provide services. I would, however, come around to one simple point--if these services do not grow enough to make a difference, then all we are doing is satisfying our interests and maybe our own needs.

A champion is needed if anything is going to move in this field. I was before the Senate Sub-Committee on Education last spring, and maybe I heard the first movement of any depth of interest in this area. The Chairman of the Senate Committee, Senator Pell, in addressing Dr. Pierce of the USOE, asked Dr. Pierce what vocational education was doing in the area of corrections. Well, that is a dirty question to anybody when you are coming berore a committee, and Dr. Pierce, of course, could not answer the question. This is not his fault; there is just no way that he could have known all that was going on--the detail. But Senator Pell stated that he wanted to know within two weeks what was being accomplished in vocational education in the field of corrections.

Maybe there is a growing interest. Maybe there will be a champion to go beyond the area of identification of needs and identification of solutions. I do not believe that we have more than touched the surface of this area in terms of implementing programs into enough services to make a difference. We are glad you are here in what may be a historical conference. We hope sincerely that these four days will not just be another conference. It may be the beginning of a movement or of a greater effort to serve a group of people who presently have very few services in the field of vocational education.

"Welcome to Ohio"

George F. Denton, Director
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
Columbus, Ohio

It is a privilege to welcome you to the State of Ohio, the city of Columbus, and The Ohio State University, but a most special welcome from the Department of Correction in the State of Ohic. I extend to you an invitation to visit any of our facilities or to contact any of the individuals supervising the programs in the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. We are located at 1050 Freeway Drive just north of Morse Road. If you are interested in visiting our Central Office staff, contact my office or the Department and we will work that out for you. If you are interested in visits to any of our seven penal institutions, you may arrange that also.

Dr. Shoemaker mentioned a very serious problem relating to vocational education in penal institutions. We are probably not really getting on with the job. I think it is very important at this workshop to build a base of "telling it like it is,"--being honest and searching for ways of improving the services.

We know from some research in vocational education in correctional institutions that six months after release from a correctional institution only 16 percent of those individuals that have graduated from vocational education programs are employed in that specialty. We know that Dr. Martinson studied over 300 programs in corrections, including education and concluded that none of them work. We have to ask the question, "where is he coming from, where are we coming from, and really what is the objective?"

It is not the single objective of corrections to educate. It is the

objective of corrections to deal with deviant behavior of individuals committed to our care and custody. You are a sub-support system to that objective. The evaluation is not completed when we merely ask "is the man still working in a job related to that which he was provided a certificate while in a correctional institution?" What was the input to deal with the problem of deviant behavior? That is what the public expects as an objective.

In Ohio, we have a unique program approved by the legislature to couple the release date of an individual in a correctional institution to the completion of his vocational training. The program is called our Vocational and Educational Furlough Program. We are not able to provide this for every inmate of our institution, but in the last two and one-half years we have provided the program to over 500 individuals. The program is regularly evaluated by contracts with The Ohio State University. We provide Halfway House placement, we pay a per diem, and we pay tuition. We are limited by funds, but when it is measured on the basis of cost effectiveness, it is successful. If you are interested in this program, contact our Community Services Division and meet the people who are responsible for the administration of the program. Mr. Morris is attending the workshop with you as Director of Education for our Department, and I am sure he will be available to assist you.

Feel free to contact our Central Office on any concerns that you might have regarding the Department in Ohio.

"Welcome to Ohio"

William Willis, Director
Ohio Youth Commission
Columbus, Ohio

Thank you. It is a pleasure and privilege to have this opportunity to offer a few remarks prior to the initiation of this important workshop. As a graduate of The Ohio State University, it is gratifying to note that this workshop was conceived and formulated by The Center for Vocational Education of The Ohio State University. As Director of the Ohio Youth Commission, I want to express our appreciation for having us involved in this workshop. Our input and representation will be borne by our Superintendent of Education, Dr. Christ L. George.

The Ohio Youth Commission is entrusted by law to receive youth aged 12 to 18 sent by the juvenile courts and to provide treatment programs for the rehabilitation of these youth. We have two divisions in the O.Y.C.: the Correctional Services Division operates eleven institutions with housing for 2,500 youth; the Community Services Division supervises 3,000 youth.

In ten of the eleven institutes of the Correctional Services Division, we operate educational programs accredited by the State Department of Education; the other one, the Child Study Center, is a short-term diagnostic center. Four of these ten institutions operate trade and industrial programs approved by the State Department of Education, offering a total of thirty-seven vocational units.

I have been affiliated with the Ohio Youth Commission since 1963, and I would like to state that the Ohio Department of Education has been supportive and helpful in our efforts to upgrade our educational offerings during my tenure.

The Division of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education has also been extremely helpful in providing teacher education and staff development programs, as well as providing expertise in the upgrading of our vocational programs.

We in the Commission are constantly seeking new ideas for incorporating sound academic and vocational concepts into our unified treatment sequence of our institutions. I see this workshop, composed of high calibre vocational educators, as being useful in not only identifying problems, but offering solutions and alternatives to sound correctional vocational education programs.

So I say to you, welcome to this conference. I look forward to the association with you, and hope your stay in the city will be well worth your being here!

"Greetings from Canada"

John W. Braithwaite, Deputy Commissioner
Canadian Penitentiary Service
Ottawa, Canada

This meeting is most timely and vital. It comes at a time when the whole correctional world is torn by dialogue and debate regarding the role and use of prisons. The possible outcome may be a dramatic shift in social policies of whole nations. New institutional models may emerge, but whether they are more productive or not remains to be seen. In some parts of the world, two fundamentally opposing views are emerging. There are those conventional prison reformers who stress the importance of greater support for institutional programs and for "treatment"; others look on this with a degree of sophisticated scorn, claiming that prisons should be restored to the role of punishment, with stiff sentences and prisoners released under supervision after the required portion of their sentences have been served.

Personally, I am more committed to the increasing support to a third point of view, which challenges the notion that criminals should be sent to prison for treatment, but maintains a sharp distinction between the purposes of incarceration and the provision of opportunities for the training and assistance of prisoners. Those of us who hold to that view argue that the behavior in prisons does not foreshadow behavior in the community and that the medical model of treatment should be abandoned. At the same time, we plead that education, vocational training, counseling and other programs should continue to be expanded with participation on a voluntary basis. This debate has only recently begun, and it may require much time and trial before it is settled. In the meantime, the realistic humanitarian prison administrator will

continue to be influenced by both hawks and doves.

I believe that educational and technical skills must be emphasized and increased for two reasons. First, and most important of these, is that there must continue to be hope for the inmate. There is a need for him to be given the opportunity to develop some constructive skills while he is serving his sentence. The prison gates in our lifetime may not become the portals to Heaven, but they must at least provide some hope of returning the inmate as a better person (or at least, no worse) to the community.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice and Standards stated that the effectiveness of the prison as a school for crime is exaggerated because the technology of crime and the ideology of crime can be better learned on the streets. The damage that prison does, however, is more subtle; attitudes are brutalized and self-confidence is lost. The prison tends to be a place of coercion where compliance is obtained by force. A typical response to coercion is alienation which may take the form of active and outright hostility or later, a passive withdrawal into alcoholism, drug abuse, or dependency. Because of this, we must continue to provide more and better programs; programs that are not based on coercion, programs that are humanly enriching in order to maintain the offender's hope and a vestige of self-respect.

Second, we must continue to emphasize educational and technical skills to enhance the strength of our total society. I am informed that, during the first quarter of this year in the age group 16-19, the unemployment rate was 20 percent. However, for blacks and other minority races, the unemployment rate was closer to 40 percent. We would be negligent indeed to recognize these figures and yet, to ignore the great repository of unskilled people who exist within our institutions--institutions which currently house some 189 of

every 100,000 American citizens.

An English statesman once said that responsibility for the harm done by criminals is directed to very few members of our society; but the responsibility for treating the offender with improper methods when better methods are known--for that harm, ladies and gentlemen--we must all share a grave responsibility. For those who continuously scream for more law and order--which tends to be the current euphemism for rigidity, regimentation and reaction--I'd like to recall the words of your past president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said:

> Human kindness has never weakened the stamina nor softened the moral fiber of a free people. A nation does not have to be cruel to be tough. In our desire to be strong, we must not lose the concept of grace.

I wish you the utmost success in this conference. You have a high purpose, a responsible calling, and a great challenge to contribute to the improvement, not just of our correctional facilities, but of our total society. The whole field of education personifies the concept that one makes a living not by what one gets, but by what one is capable of giving to others. You have much to give, and I hope that this conference will enhance your future gifts and insure and enrich your rewards. I thank you again and God bless you all.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF THE WORKSHOP PROGRAM

The following is the complete, revised description of the workshop presenters and activities.

OPENING SESSION

Welcome to The Center	Robert E. Taylor, Director The Center for Vocational Education
Workshop Evaluation	Carlene Tondryk, Resource Evaluator The Center for Vocational Education
Welcome to the Buckeye State	Byrl R. Shoemaker, State Director Division of Vocational Education Ohio Department of Education
	George F. Denton, Director Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
	William K. Willis, Director Ohio Youth Commission
Greetings from Canada	John Braithwaite, Deputy Commissioner Canadian Penitentiary Service Past President, American Correctional Association

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: "LEAA: Is There a Future for Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions Today?"

Ken Carpenter, Chief of Corrections
Office of Regional Operations
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

WORK SESSION: TOPIC I

"How Do We Develop the Role of Vocational Education in Corrections?"

Speaker	Sherwood Dees, Assistant Superintendent Vocational & Technical Education Illinois Office of Education
Reactors	Lane Murray, Superintendent Windham School District Texas Department of Corrections

Lowell Burkett, Executive Director
American Vocational Association

Small Group Discussion and Planning Session

Small Group Reports for Topic I

WORK SESSION: TOPIC II

"How De We Meet the Needs of Students?"

Speakers

William E. Monroe, Vocational Coordinator
Windham School District
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Euphesenia Foster, Coordinator
International Women's Year
Women Offender Activities
Department of Labor
Washington, D.C.

Reactors

Sherman Day, Director
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

Max Lerner, Vice Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio

Ruth M. Glick, Director
National Study of Women's Correctional Programs
Berkeley, California

Small Group Discussion and Planning Session

Luncheon

"Redefining the Problem"

Speaker

Gary Weissman, Chief
Corrections Task Force
Office of Manpower Programs
U. S. Department of Labor
Washington. D.C.

Small Group Report for Topic III

WORK SESSION: TOPIC III

"How Do We Develop Realistic Programs?"

Speakers	Amos Reed, Administrator Oregon Corrections Division and President, Association of State Correctional Administrators Salem, Oregon
	Francis T. Tuttle Director of Vocational Education State Department of Education Stillwater, Oklahoma and President, National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education Stillwater, Oklahoma
Reactors	Anthony P. Travisono Executive Director American Correctional Association College Park, Maryland
	Ralph Bregman, Assistant Director EPDA Division of Vocational Education University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
	Euphesenia Foster, Coordinator International Women's Year Women Offender Activities Department of Labor Washington, D.C.

Small Group Discussion and Planning Session

Small Group Reports for Topic III

Luncheon Address	"The Conversion Process--From Tax Burden to Tax Payer"
Speaker	LeRoy Cornelson Director of Planning Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education U. S. Office of Education Washington, D.C.

WORK SESSION: TOPIC IV

"How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches to Vocational Education in Corrections?"

Speakers

Byrl R. Shoemaker, State Director
Division of Vocational Education
Ohio Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio

Sylvia McCollum
Education Research Specialist
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

John Armore, Director
Ex-Offender Program
National Alliance of Businessmen
Washington, D.C.

Reactors

Tim Durkin, Coordinator
Offender Programs
Human Resources Development Institute
AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Arlene Erlick
Indiana State Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Indianapolis, Indiana

Small Group Discussion and Planning Session

Small Group Reports for Topic IV

CONCLUDING SESSION

Conference Summary, Development of Priorities and Evaluation

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS AND PRESENTERS

Participants and Presenters

Lawrence M. Aber
Supervisor, Vocational Education
Missouri Division of Corrections
911 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

David L. Anderson
Program Specialist
Kansas Department of Education
State Office Building
120 East Tenth
Topeka, Kansas 66612

John Armore
Director, Ex-Offender Program
National Alliance of Businessmen
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

David Bachman
Assistant Director
Florida Dept. of Offender Rehabilitation
1311 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32101

Richard Barnwell
Assistant Commissioner
Occupational Education Department
New York State University
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12230

James G. Bennett
Senior Research Associate
Cornell University
Research Park, Bldg. #1, Room 193
Ithaca, New York 14850

Hal Birkland
Coordinator, Special Needs Program
Minnesota Department of Education
Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

John W. Braithwaite
Deputy Commissioner, Inmate Programs
Canadian Penitentiary Service
340 Laurier Avenue, West
Ottawa, Ontario K1A OP9

Ralph Bregman
Assistant Director, EPDA
University of California, Los Angeles
Division of Vocational Education
123 Moore Hall, 405 Hilgard
Los Angeles, California 90024

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Association
1510 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Raymond J. Cole
Chief Supervisor
Adult Voc. Training Prog. Operations
Department of Education
P. O. Box 578
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Ken Carpenter
Chief of Corrections
Office of Regional Operations
U. S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administation
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Bennett J. Cooper
Deputy Administrator
Administration of Justice Division
Dept. of Economic & Community Develop.
State Office Tower, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mike Corbin
Director, Parchman Vocational School
Mississippi State State Penitentiary
P. O. Box 188
Parchman, Mississippi 38738

LeRoy A. Cornelson
Director of Planning
Bureau of Occupational & Adult Educ.
U. S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Jean Cary Davis
State Supervisor
Special Needs Programs
West Virginia State Dept. of Educ.
State Capitol Complex
Building #6, Room B-230
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Sherman Day
Director
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Sherwood Dees
Assistant Superintendent
Vocational and Technical Education
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street, E-439
Springfield, Illinois 62777

George Denton
Director
Dept. of Rehabilitation & Correction
1050 Freeway Drive, N., Suite 403
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Tim Durkin
Coordinator, Offender Programs
Human Resource Development Institute
815 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Arline C. Erlick
Assistant to Indiana State Advisory
Council for Vocational Education
803 State Office Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

J. Clark Esarey
Superintendent, School District 428
301 Armory Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Auston B. Ezzell
Research Consultant, Ohio Advisory
Council for Vocational Education
5900 Sharon Woods Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Euphesenia Foster
IWY Coordinator
Women Offender Activities
Department of Labor, Women's Bureau
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

Christ L. George
Superintendent of Education
Ohio Youth Commission
2236 South Hamilton Road
Columbus, Ohio 43227

Mario George
Program Specialist
Dept. of Health, Education, & Welfare
Research Branch, Room 5018, ROB #3
7th & D Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ruth M. Glick
Director, National Study of Women's
Correctional Programs
2054 University Avenue, Room 301
Berkeley, California 94704

Kenneth Green
Assistant State Director
Trade and Industrial Education
Washington, D.C.

Edmund J. Gubbins
Superintendent of Schools
Department of Correction
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

E. F. Hilfiker
Education Coordinator
Oregon State Correctional Institute
3405 Deer Park Drive, S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Vernon G. Housewright
Corrections Superintendent III
Vienne Correctional Center
Vienna, Illinois 62995

James W. Hoy
Superintendent
Department of Social Services
Iowa Training School for Boys
Eldora, Iowa 60627

Caroline E. Hughes
Chairman, Interagency Commission
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Elayn Hunt
Director
Louisiana Department of Corrections
P. O. Box 44304, Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Charles R. Jaymes
Educational Program Specialist
U. S. Office of Education
Dept. of Health, Education, & Welfare
300 South Wacker Drive, 32nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

A. Neil Johnson
Vocational Supervisor for Corrections
Ohio State Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Richard Johnston
Teacher Educator
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Ella M. Kelly
Acting Chief
Career Access-Education and Work
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 00208

Max J. Lerner
Vice-Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents, Two Year Campus
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mark A. Levine
Commissioner
Maryland Division of Correction
6314 Windors Mill Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Merritt D. Long
Director, Corrections Clearinghouse
Airdustrial Park, Building #17
Olympia, Washington 98504

James R. Mahoney
Project Director
Offender Assistance Through
Community Colleges
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W. - Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pat O. Mancini
Education Program Specialist
Division of Education for the Handicapped
U. S. Office of Education
ROB #3, Room 3659
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Alphonse F. Maresh
Educational Coordinator
Minnesota State Dept. of Corrections
430 Metro Square
7th and Robert Streets
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Sylvia G. McCollum
Education Research Specialist
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Peter Merrett
Acting Director, Occupational Develop.
Canadian Penitentiary Service
340 Laurier Avenue, West
Ottawa, Ontaria, Canada K1A OP9

William Monroe
Vocational Program Coordinator
Texas Department of Corrections
Windham School District
P. O. Box 40
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Paul Morin
Administrator, Corrections Education
Moraine Park Technical Institute
Box 147
Fox Lake, Wisconsin 53933

Harrison L. Morris
Director of Educational Services
Dept. of Rehabilitation & Corrections
Ohio Central School System
1050 Freeway Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43229

B. J. Murdock
Dean, Program Development
Texarkana Community College
Texarkana, Texas 75501

Lane Murray
Superintendent
Texas Department of Corrections
Windham School District
P. O. Box 40
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Duane M. Nielsen
Chief of Vocational Education
Personnel Development
Bureau of Occupational & Adult Educ.
U. S. Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Joe Palmer
Deputy Director, Community Services
Ohio Youth Commission
2236 South Hamilton Road
Columbus, Ohio 43227

Laurel L. Rans
Consultant, Entropy Limited
214 South Craig Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Amos E. Reed
Administrator, Oregon Corrections Division
Oregon Corrections Division
2575 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 95310

Bill Reitz
Assistant Branch Director
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Fred Santaniello
Monitoring/Evaluation Specialist
Office of Manpower Affairs
One Weybossett Hill
Providence, Rhode Island 02904

Bob Shanberg
Assistant Superintendent
Program Planning & Development
Dept. of Institutions and Agencies
1901 North Olden Avenue Extension
Trenton, New Jersey 08618

Ted Shannon
Teacher Educator
Dept. of Vocational-Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Byrl Shoemaker
State Director
Division of Vocational Education
65 South Front Street, Room 612
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Philip J. Tardanico
Director of Education
Massachusetts Dept. of Corrections
Leverett Saltonstall Building
100 Cambridge Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02202

Ronald C. Tarlaian
Educational Program Specialist
CETA Coordination Unit
U. S. Office of Education, Room 5008
ROB #3, 7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
4321 Hartwick Road, Suite L-208
College Park, Maryland 20749

Francis Tuttle
State Director
State Dept. of Vocational
and Technical Education
1515 West Sixth Avenue
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Donald R. Ventetuolo
Director of Education
Department of Corrections
75 Howard Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920

Gary Weissman
Chief, Offender Programs
Department of Labor
(Employment Training Administation)
601 D Street, N.W., Room 5002
Washington, D.C. 20213

Karin Stork Whitson
Consultant
National Study of Women's
Correctional Programs
1537 Longeaton Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43220

William Willis
Director, Correctional Services
Ohio Youth Commission
2234 South Hamilton Road
Columbus, Ohio 43227

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP MAJOR ADDRESSES

These addresses were presented at the Workshop to Improve Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions at The Center for Vocational Education of The Ohio State University, October 28-31, 1975. They received limited editing by the project staff.

"Is There a Future for Vocational Education
In Correctional Institutions Today?"

Ken Carpenter, Chief of Corrections
Office of Regional Operations
Washington, D.C.

Your workshop this week is looking at a timely issue at a significant time. As Norval Morris says in his recent publication, The Future of Imprisonment, "prisons have few friends; dissatisfaction with them is widespread." And rightly so. Our country has been paying a high price--in rising crime--for the past dismal failure of our criminal justice system to rehabilitate. About four out of every five felonies are committed by repeaters.

The agency I represent, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, established in 1968, initiated a national effort to combat crime by giving financial and technical assistance to state and local criminal justice agencies. A later amendment to the 1968 legislation, commonly referred to as Part E, was passed in 1971 to speed the process of corrections reform.

Funds for LEAA increased sharply in the past six years the agency has been operating. For fiscal 1969, the total budget was $63 million; in fiscal 1970, it was $698 million; in the fiscal year that ended last June 30, it was $880 million.

In the early days, there was a feeling by some that LEAA was basically a police program. Police needs were, as a matter of fact, very urgent, and possibly more easily documented at that time than the needs of corrections or the court systems. So, of the first year's funds, less than ten percent of our block-action funds went to corrections. Undoubtedly, there was a lack of commitment to the needs of corrections in fiscal 1969. However, considerable

effort was made by the LEAA Administration to improve corrections funding, and recent data indicate that over $1 billion in block, discretionary and technical assistance funds have been committed to juvenile and adult corrections programs. This represents approximately 39% of the total amount LEAA funds which have gone into the various program areas.

Early in the history of LEAA, funding decisions had to be made about the use of LEAA funds for corrections. If LEAA was to undertake the task of rebuilding corrections in a single year, it would have cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $15 billion to $25 billion at that time; but this sum of money was simply not available and would not be available in the foreseeable future.

In determining where to start and where to make a major effort with the available resources, LEAA decided to emphasize those program areas which would affect the greatest number of offenders so hopefully we would get the most for our money. Thus, we decided not to start with the prisons since they had the fewest clients, yet would be the most expensive component of the corrections system.

With this recognition, LEAA decided to focus on community-based programs such as probation and parole, halfway houses, group homes, work release, diagnostic services, jail services, etc. The Part E amendment spelled these priorities out in considerably more detail.

It is difficult to know how successful we have been in this effort; our data are somewhat incomplete. This philosophy, I believe, has channeled more funds into program areas than into construction (for which we have had many requests). Available data indicates that less than 20 percent of LEAA money has gone into construction. Further, although current data indicates

approximately the same amount of funding going into the institution area as community-based programs, it would be my analysis that more money has gone into community-based programs than would have been the case had we not prioritized community-based program for funding.

Of the amount of funding LEAA has channeled into the corrections area approximately $75 million has gone into vocational training programs. In reviewing the print-outs of these programs, the following are examples of those funded:

1. E.C.C.C. Vocational Training and Counseling Services — $418,105
   County of Essex Corrections Center
   Caldwell, New Jersey

   This project established a program of seven vocational skill shops (auto transmission, auto air conditioning, general maintenance, landscaping, welding, major appliance repair and small diesel engine repair) and a psychological testing and treatment unit. The project was to vocationally train 180-210 inmates, refer 180-210 trained inmates to a newly established project for job placement, diagnose between 300-500 inmates and treat 75 inmates for psychological problems. During the first year of the project over 150 inmates were trained and an equal amount psychologically tested and treated.

2. Vocational Training Division Equipment — 50,000
   Department of Institutions
   Denver, Colorado

   The Vocational Training Division of the Colorado Department of Institutions needs to provide more realistic training for the vocational students at the Colorado State Reformatory. To do so, it must replace and update its equipment to fit the needs of industry. The number one priority of this project is to equip the vocational shops with modern, functional industrial equipment.

3. Institutional Improvement — 16,510
   Social Services
   Lansing, Michigan

   Continuation of grant funded earlier. Forty youth from two camps were to be selected to participate in a vocational education program at a nearby community college. Students selected through tests administered at camp sites. Those youths demonstrating potential to learn welding or machine operation were offered the courses. To

date twenty boys have completed their courses and were released to aftercare. Five are employed in fields directly related to his skill training.

4. Expand Vocational and Education Services at the West Virginia Penitentiary — $ 182,700

Objective of the grant is to supply all equipment and supplies necessary for the establishment and/or expansion of education and vocational programs at the penitentiary.

5. Vocational Counseling Program — 185,000
Illinois Department of Corrections

The Department's Vocational Counseling Program has established the basic structure for providing career development skills for resident inmates within correctional facilities throughout the State of Illinois. Intention of the project is to expand on these skills and provide for a more comprehensive package of services to residents as they re-enter their home communities.

6. Vocational Rehabilitation — 66,000
Ramsey County
Minnesota

Project represents a cooperative effort between the St. Paul schools, the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Ramsey County Department of Court Services, to create comprehensive vocational rehabilitation planning for adjudicated youth in the county.

7. Vocational Education Program — 1,924,653
New York State Department of Correctional Services

Project will provide funds for modern vocational training equipment, recruitment of skills personnel to provide inmates with their career planning; upgrade present audio-visual capability to improve production techniques; establish regional education supervision positions in three areas of state to provide direction in the overall development of facility, academic and vocational programs.

Mr. Richard W. Velde, who has been with LEAA since it was established, and who was sworn in as LEAA administrator on September 5, 1974, has been a supporter of the significance of vocational education for offenders for many years. In a statement prepared for a May 20, 1971, hearing before the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, Mr. Velde indicated that the unemployment

of offenders was not indicative of their unemployability. He stated, "I am convinced there is great, untapped potential among the offenders, and there is potential for them. Many, many offenders can make it in society. Not all, but many. We cannot expect 100 percent success, for we cannot expect to deal completely with all the manifold problems of the offenders under correctional supervision." Continuing with his statement he went on further to say, "but many can be rehabilitated and I suspect that the number who can be, successfully, is far greater than any of us can imagine under the present, outmoded correctional concepts. We should concentrate on education, training, and treatment which is geared toward motivating and preparing offenders for worthwhile jobs. We should help them find the jobs and assist them in the critical post-release period with the problems that prevent successful employment."

More recently in Mr. Velde's first statement of priorities upon being named LEAA's Administrator, he stated, "Inmate training and education programs must be drastically upgraded. Simple incarceration is wasteful and destructive."

LEAA is somewhat in the same position as those of you here today and is asking the question, "What corrections programs should be funded and how much money should go into programs such as vocational education?" We are aware that the same issues have to be analyzed if we are to answer the questions which you will be asking during this week's discussions.

What are the issues to which I'm referring? I suppose the first which comes to my mind (and perhaps yours, too) concerns the whole question of the value of rehabilitation. Dr. Robert Martinson's statement "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitation efforts that have been reported so

far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism," has sent currents of pessimism, disillusionment and disarray throughout corrections not only in the United States but throughout the world. But Dr. Martinson's pronouncements are not the only concerns of today's corrections administrators. The whole discussion of the indeterminate sentence has also provoked considerable concern and questioning of our current corrections programs. Richard McGee, Director of the American Justice Institute, Sacramento, California, and David Fogel, Director of Illinois' Law Enforcement Commission, are but two of the advocates of this philosophy.

This view is not all that differs from the recently stated philosophy of Norman Carlson, Director of the U. S. Bureau of Prisons. In April of this year, Mr. Carlson announced that the Bureau was placing more emphasis on viewing imprisonment as a means of retribution or punishment and deterence. It is his belief that this is a more honest one in terms of describing what is being done with inmates in the federal prison system. Inasmuch as it is thought that coercion is not effective, inmates will be more involved in selecting program alternatives and a greater emphasis will be given to more meaningful programs and an increased commitment to quality education, vocational counseling and community programs.

Norval Morris, Dean of the University of Chicago School of Law, takes the same position in his recent book, The Future of Imprisonment. He states that an inmate "can be in the institution and can be guaranteed his graduated release opportunities entirely independently of participation in any program other than in the small group discussion."

Add to these issues yet another, and that is what we are seeing in at least two states, Minnesota and Vermont, and in some juvenile programs, namely

the state of Massachusetts. The administrators of these programs believe that institutions are "debilitating." Thus, the state training schools of Massachusetts were all closed several years ago; Vermont's State Correctional Facility at Windsor, which was opened in 1809, was closed a few weeks ago; and Minnesota now has a committee studying the many issues involved in closing its state prison in Stillwater, which was opened in 1913.

This is not to say that such states have ruled out institutionalization for some offenders. In the case of Vermont the small number of offenders who need to be in a secure institutional setting will be transferred to the Bureau of Prisons' facilities. Similarly, Minnesota plans to eventually have only one secure institution for adults in the state.

So, even though a number of significant issues keep a lot of corrections administrators in a state of restlessness and ambivalence, there seems little doubt that a future for prisons and prison programs exists. Norval Morris discusses this need most eloquently in The Future of Imprisonment. He refers to this group of "repetitively violent criminals" as those "who account for a disproportionately large number of violent offenses" . . . who are "a source of anxiety within the prison walls as well as in society-at-large." But even though they are this severely dangerous and require a secure and long-term setting, "we have a moral obligation at least to allow those serving extended terms an opportunity to make some constructive use of the time we have demanded of them."

Thus, in spite of the fact that (Dr. Robert Martinson points out) studies fail to show that education and skill development reduce recidivism, we do need to develop the kinds of programs within the institution which will provide the type of constructive activity referred to by Norval Morris. I suppose

when we discuss such programs, we need to be cognizant of those individuals and groups which are taking a highly pessimistic view of attempts to do anything with our criminal justice system. In this connection, a series of three articles examining the criminal justice system which appeared in the Wall Street Journal earlier this month, were indicative of such a view point. Of interest to our discussion this week, one statement is particularly pertinent. The author wrote, "We urgently need improved and enlarged prisons, but not for the idealistic reasons usually cited." Rehabilitation is beyond the reach or desire of many prisoners. Frills such as swimming pools, stereo equipment and steak, and even the so called reform expenses for psychologists and vocational training, have little effect in maintaining inmate calm, or studies show, in lowering the rate of repeat offenses.

Yet, let's take a look for a moment at some of the findings which Dr. Martinson and others have made which might give us some direction for our discussions. For example, he indicates that "there is evidence that vocationally oriented training programs for youthful offenders (over 16) both in institutions and in the community are associated with lower rates of recidivism than standard institutional care or standard parole. These programs appear to be successful when they provide the offender with a readily marketable skills."

His findings also indicate the importance of having vocational training programs and work experience in institutions geared to the job opportunities that are available for offenders. Although it is not a new idea to those of you here, he also points out that "to teach offenders building trades when positions in unions are not available to them or to teach them to be electronic data processing machine operators when employers are unwilling to hire them in that capacity may very well be more detrimental than not training them at all."

Dr. Daniel Glaser's recent monograph, Strategic Criminal Justice Planning, for the National Institute of Mental Health's Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, also has some pertinent findings regarding vocational training. In speaking of the career-oriented criminal he indicates that "the recidivism of this group becomes lower if they are given programs that emphasize tangible rewards (e.g., pay or privileges) for significant achievements in the pursuit of legitimate alternatives to crime (e.g., earning academic credits or mastering usable vocational skills) than if they are given programs emphasizing counseling or psychotherapy." In discussing this behavior modification principle he points out that "for positive reinforcement from legitimate employment, most career-oriented criminals must first increase their academic and vocational education." Although they have often been "big shots" in delinquent activities they qualify only for the most menial unskilled jobs. School has frequently been a humilitating experience for them except when they could manipulate school authorities and evade academic requirements. Programmed education and token economies, by providing tangible rewards for each feasible increment of learning, have demonstrated repeatedly that the academic and vocational skills of offenders can be much improved. This is verified in experiments and quasi-experiments in institutions and in the community (Cohen and Fillipczak 1971, Odell 1974). Furthermore, in the few cases where it has been researched, appreciable increments in education, such as procurement of diplomas and licenses rather than merely nominal school attendance, are associated with less recidivism (Glaser 1969).

In summary, in spite of the numerous winds of change which trouble and preoccupy many corrections administrators today, there is every reason to believe we will continue to have prisons for many years to come. And even

though there continue to be critics of providing constructive programming for offenders in institutions, there will be programs of this nature available to them. What may very well be different in the future, however, is the makeup of the institution population, the perspective of the individual offender in his or her participation in the program, and a more equal role of skill training opportunities with clinical services.

"Redefining the Problem"

Gary A. Weissman, Chief
Corrections Task Force, Office of Manpower Programs
Washington, D.C.

In a previous vocational incarnation, I was an historian of sorts; and I was constantly amazed at the contrast between my own personal experience of change occurring in almost imperceptible increments with the compulsion of historians to fix centuries-long processes with specific dates. It implied that everyone in England, for example, woke up on January 1, 1750, and said, "Well, the Industrial Revolution is beginning this year--we better get prepared for the influx from the countryside." A few prescient individuals may in fact have made such statements, but they would have been dismissed as radicals. More likely, no one made such a statement because of the difficulty of perceiving change in the midst of its process.

It would be serendipitous if future historians of corrections would mention this conference, at least in a footnote, not so much as the event which triggered a revolution in American corrections but rather as a conference whose participants did something very unusual--namely manifesting an understanding of the processes of historical change and of planning accordingly.

The famous aphorism that "those who are ignorant of history are condemned to repeat it" needs to be updated a bit to "those who are ignorant of history's direction will be unable to shape its trajectory." It is difficult to address the question of the future of vocational education in corrections if we are in the dark about the future of corrections. We need to analyze the inevitable and likely trends in our future shock pace of

accelerated change in corrections in the United States.

One good starting point is a new book called Corrections in America by Harry Allen and Clifford Simonson who are affiliated, appropriately enough, with the Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency here at Ohio State. Allen and Simonson trace the origins of many of the accoutrements of the correctional appratus in this country and point out rather devastatingly that concepts long consigned to the trashbin of intellectual history still underlie many of the processes and institutions which we characterize as the criminal justice system.

Institutions with separate cells designed to afford the solitude necessary for penitence; the concept of hard labor consistent with Calvinist revulsion with idleness; conventional prison architecture with interior cell blocks, congregate work areas; and solitary confinement for transgressors of prison rules--all grew out of the model at the New York State Prison at Auburn in 1819. Indeterminate sentences, now attacked as abusive and as inequitable devices of coercion, were introduced as a reform in the 19th Century by an Irishman named Walter Crofton, who quite logically reasoned that if the purpose of corrections was reformation, then there had to be a way of releasing the prisoners who successfully repented.

Vocational education and training in prisons, I am sorry to report, does not have much of a pedigree. The first known workhouse appeared in Elizabethan London as a shelter for the urban poor but soon became the repository for misdemeanants and status criminals. Entrepreneurs of the day, faced with a labor shortage, convinced the Crown to permit private enterprise to put the workhouse occupants to work. The idea spread like wildfire across Europe, and after prisons were introduced into the United States

by the Quakers, prison industries were initiated to make prisons economically self-sufficient. The fledgling labor unions, however, recognized the cheap prison labor as a form of unfair competition which resulted in suppressed wages on the outside; and since the New Deal we have had federal and state statutes which in effect proscribe the interstate transportation of prison-made goods.

The upshot of all of that is that prison administrators are left with 19th Century fortresses designed around 18th Century notions in which nobody any longer believes, and housing 20th Century prisoners who express their displeasure with the Auburn model by rioting. Corrections officials are impelled by logistics and politics to be preeminently concerned about security; the situs of their places of business makes staff recruitment difficult; and they are at a loss to carry out management planning since the courts determine their inflow while the parole boards decide their outflow. It is little wonder that prison administrators put vocational education 347th on their priority lists.

You who are vocational educators either possess or have developed a high degree of frustration tolerance; and I mention that only to assure you that we federal bureaucrats are aware of the implausibility of conducting viable vocational education programs which invariably take a back seat to everything from roll calls to disciplinary confinement.

Robert Martinson's name has been invoked recently by supporters of the "lock-'em-up-and-throw-away-the-key" theory of corrections. Martinson has gotten considerable publicity amplifying his findings in the now famous report, summarized by many journalists as "nothing works."

In one sense Martinson and the attendant publicity have served an

affirmative end in crystallizing debate and setting the scene for the generation of new ideas; but the strangest phenomenon about the whole issue is that everyone in the field of corrections is discussing the Martinson/Lipton/Wilkes report, but no one seems to have read it. I am among their number, unfortunately. But those who have read it assert that the report belies Martinson's public statements, that is to say, the report in fact enumerates a number of successful rehabilitation programs.

Secondly, as even Martinson himself concedes, the thrust of his findings is not so much that the programs have been lousy but that the research has been lousy.

Lastly, the report stops with programs and research in 1967. Given the tremendous expansion and upgrading of programs in the last eight years, it is analogous to having a debate today about the validity of an essay written in 1972 on the impotence of petroleum producing countries to impact the American economy.

Facts, of course, are not always useful in debate on social issues. Psychologists use the term "cognitive dissonance" to label the ability of human beings to screen out data which undercut prejudices. And cognitive dissonance in 1975 will surely cause those disposed to wipe out vocational educational programs in corrections to redouble their efforts.

Having implied rather strongly that I believe that vocational education programs in corrections can in fact be rehabilitative, socially useful, and even correlative with a reduction in recidivism, I should tug at the rug under your chairs by saying straight out that the Department of Labor is not

currently using /earmarked offender program/ monies and has no immediate plans to support vocational educational programs in State prisons.

The reason for that is as follows: Under the Manpower Development and Training Act amendments of 1966, the Department of Labor (DOL) funded vocational training programs for inmates for about seven years. A recent evaluation of those programs by Dr. Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik concluded that such programs were indeed feasible but that they did not eventuate in many jobs for ex-inmates because of a lack of linkages with job placement resources and of the prevalence of employment disability statutes which bar ex-offenders from many occupations. Absent some proof to the contrary, I find myself in agreement with William Nagle who wrote in a delightful book entitled The New Red Barn:

> The corrosive reality of prison life, both for the guards and the guarded, is the inevitable product of a process that confines people in limited space and deprives them of their liberty and humanity. . . . It is unrealistic to expect the State to /simultaneously/ guard, control, punish, and redeem /the inmates/.

What factors from the trends of the 1970s must we factor into our analysis? For one thing the World War II baby boom has hit state prisons. The number of people in the age bracket who consistently commit a plurality of crimes, namely those between the ages of 18 and 28, comprise a disproportionate percentage of the population. Their absolute numbers will continue to rise until 1985. Consequently, for the next ten years, at least, we are likely to have an increasing amount of offenses committed even if the crime rate is reduced. And if the state and local decision makers respond politically by emphasizing crime detection and arrests, then we can predict that the next decade will witness an exacerbation of the overloading of the other elements of the criminal justice system: delayed trials, overcrowded prisons,

hopelessly overloaded probation and parole officers. And when prisons get too overcrowded, we get riots. Suppressing the riots gets at the underlying problems about as well as mowing down the crabgrass.

Riots aren't the only reaction to overcrowded prisons, however. There is also judicial intervention. Earlier this year the Federal District Court for the Middle District of Alabama enjoined the Alabama Department of Corrections from putting any more convicted felons into the state prison until the prison population is reduced to the size for which it was constructed (approximately one-third of its current population). Alabama has decided to keep prisoners in county jails until it can comply with the court order.

Alabama's neighbor to the east, Georgia, announced the day before yesterday that it would forestall federal court intervention by early releases of inmates incarcerated for non-violent crimes. The State of Wisconsin has evidently decreased the number of its state prison inmates by paroling or releasing on probation 90 percent of the inmates. Interestingly, the crime rate in Wisconsin is still far below the national average.

Moreover, the pre-trial intervention programs which DOL financed in two cities in the late 1960s has spread to 120 communities across the United States.

You vocational educators know far better than I that vocational education has suffered from two other problems over which you have no control: (1) once an institution has invested previous funds in vocational training equipment and software, it is frequently unwilling and invariably unable to make expenditures for different programs even though the old programs have been made obsolete by changing labor market conditions; (2) many prisoners who haven't either the interest or inclination in welding (or whatever other vocational educational

opportunity happens to be available) to sign up because of the residual "correctional" notion that participation in the vocational education course is an outward sign of the inward grace of rehabilitation.

In a nutshell, economics, demography, and history are combining to signal the end of the Auburn prison model. Alcatraz is closed, and others of its ilk are likely to become empty hulks. Whereas community correctional facilities, non-prosecution of status offenders, contract parole, diversion programs, work release, and unsupervised probation are all likely to expand geometrically in the next ten years. Very likely, state prisons are bound to become the repositories of the small minority of hardened, repeated, and violent criminals on whom everyone has given up.

Where does vocational education fit into this picture? My own view is that vocational educators ought to be the linchpins in the process of fairly radical change needed to keep pace with the change in corrections.

As future shock paralyzes many of our colleagues unable to cope with the accelerated processes of change, the creative energies of progressive vocational educators are essential to enable the needed changes to flourish.

For one thing it means shifting the focus from the state prisons to the county jails, which have larger populations on any given day than do state prisons. Jails almost universally have no programs at all but are likely to become even more overcrowded as other states follow Alabama's reluctant lead.

Precisely because county jails are in the community and not isolated out in the country, the public image of county jails' inmates is often more human (they are, after all, people from the local community). Therefore, jails constitute fertile soil for the growth of programs which will achieve the reintegrative purposes we would all like to see accomplished.

Secondly, stretch the rubber band of the definition of vocational education to a more expansive shape. Use the skills and talents of vocational educators to turn jailers and guards into correctional counselors; help your states follow Massachusetts' example and convince the state legislature to declare jails to be school districts, and then arrange for inmates to take courses at the local vocational high schools without having to replicate their facilities at the jail.

Instead of enforced idleness or make-work activities, put the inmates to work at meaningful public interest jobs. If you do set up vocational education programs in the community correctional facilities or the jails, extend participation to the guards and to the surrounding community residents and thereby convert the jail into a community resource.

A wild dream? No, it's already happening in Berkshire County, Massachusetts. Most of the ideas were developed by an ex-convict named Larry Dye who is now an assistant professor of education at the University of Massachusetts and the director of the Model Education Program. Berkshire County jail inmates are counselors for youths under custody of the Westfield Detention Center and also work as recreation aides with residents of the Belchertown State School for the Mentally Retarded. Some get academic leave to take college courses; and students from the University of Massachusetts voluntarily commit themselves to 90 days in the Berkshire County jail (and get nine credits of practicum credit for doing it).

Dye and his colleagues did get some money from HEW's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, but most of the ideas require attitudinal change more than money. The Model Education Program has won the support of such community groups as the Berkshire Bar Association, which provides free

legal services and the Massachusetts Correctional Association, which provides job placement. The program has as its planning arm, the Sheriff's Association, which includes guards, staff, inmates, and members of the community. Inmate and correctional officer teams conduct leadership training courses for inmates at other correctional institutions and for health workers and juvenile counselors in Berkshire County. Even the local schools have now asked the inmate-officer teams to help handle discipline problems.

Begin with the premise that most prisons are not satisfactory settings to rehabilitate; then the logical next step is to move vocational educational programs to settings which are conducive to reintegration.

Become advocates of change in the process which blocks vocational education's effectiveness. Vocational educators should take a lead role in persuading the executive branches of your respective states to propose legislation which would amend or repeal employment disability statutes. Play honest broker in introducing local manpower planners to local criminal justice operators.

And finally, once you and your colleagues develop a truly comprehensive program for offenders, from pre-trial detainees through probationers and inmates to ex-offenders and parolees, then demand of us "feds" that we stop funding different fragments and instead jointly fund a local service delivery system which has only one set of guidelines to live up to.

The bottom line is that there is a bright future for vocational education in corrections if, and only if, we redefine the problem and accordingly redefine the role of vocational education. If you don't do it, I can't think of any other group that will.

"The Conversion Process--From Tax Burden to Tax Payer"

LeRoy A. Cornelson, Director of Planning
United States Office of Education
Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education
Washington, D.C.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to be with you today to participate in your deliberations and hopefully contribute to the discussion of a vital subject--that of improving the opportunities for offenders to develop and reorganize their human assets so they may once again contribute to society.

As officials who are in charge of our nation's prisons and correctional facilities rethink the basic assumptions on which prisons have been operating for the last fifty years, I consider that we have an opportunity to examine the feasibility of improving that system by utilizing high quality vocational education to prepare offenders for a new life in which they can use salable skills in demand occupations for gaining access to jobs which provide personal rewards and make corporate contributions.

Frankly, such discussions may be somewhat difficult when other previously "unquestioned" truths are being debated and re-examined about the entire prison and incarceration system. There are obviously no easy answers, although the trend appears to be away from indeterminant sentences to fixed sentences, from forced vocational and psychological treatment to voluntary rehabilitation. The very fact that these different concerns are being discussed is hopeful. In fact, a recent issue of Corrections Magazine, a new and respected journal of prison affairs supported by the American Bar Association, devoted twenty-seven pages to an article on the current ferment in the field. That article concluded by recommending that a radically new approach is needed that will provide both better protection for the public and a more realistic view of what

can and cannot be done to cut recidivism and the return to criminal behavior. What new approach should be taken is a matter of dispute.

One must readily admit that the environment in which the offender is housed, the conditions under which life goes on in prison, the environment, whether penal and punitive or rehabilitative and correctional, makes a great difference as to what extent vocational education can be a useful and beneficial service for offenders. But in spite of that fact, it seems clear at this time that clear cut solutions to the age old problems of what to do with those individuals deemed law breakers still eludes us. I personally have a firm belief that an individual who has a salable skill and is interested in pursuing values somewhat in harmony with those of the rest of society and able to work for wages, removes one of the numerous reasons for criminal activity.

However, I am certainly not naive enough to pass this point without commenting that there are many other reasons which cannot be affected by vocational education which in a major way affect the behavior of individuals in our society, often resulting in criminal behavior. Henry Knoble, Warden for the New York City Department of Corrections, once expressed this belief as follows. He said that "vocational education is a part of the rehabilitative process because inmates who learn marketable skills will have no economic incentives to return to crime after their release from prison." But before we go further in the discussion of this topic, let's take a look at the size and scope of the population that is now in prison and see the extent to which vocational education programs are now being provided.

Before citing a few germane statistics, I encountered a great deal of difficulty in accumulating accurate information about programs of vocational education in corrections, primarily because there really is no central source

for information in this area. Definitions are terribly elusive. For example, correctional educators and vocational educators utilize the term "vocational education" differently. One talks about students in a curriculum learning a salable skill, the other includes prison industries and maintenance programs even if their main purpose is not to provide vocational education. Furthermore, the term "corrections" may in some places be limited to such things as prisons and jails or conversely expanded to include community programs counting prisoners on probation, parole or pre-trial diversion. Another very difficult term is the word "recidivism." It is often defined as an offense committed by an ex-offender. However, the term "offense" may mean in one case parole violation, commission of a crime, or reincarceration. The data available can be used as indicators, but I am not satisfied that all are valid.

Let's look briefly at the profile of the inmate population. At the end of 1970, there were 196,429 persons incarcerated in American prisons. 176,000 plus were in state adult institutions and slightly more than 20,000 were in federal institutions. As of December 1, 1973, the number of inmates in state adult institutions increased nearly three percent to 181,000. And as of June 30, 1974, the number of prisoners in federal institutions increased by more than 14 percent to nearly 23,000. The average length of confinement in these prisons is 26.4 months. The population of correctional institutions includes those incarcerated in local jails. Another interesting fact is that minority groups are disproportionately represented in the inmate population. The ratio of minority to whites is almost one to one or 49 to 51 percent in the prisons surveyed by the Battelle Institute. Many of these inmates are repeaters. Only 7.9 percent of those incarcerated in federal prisons had no arrest prior to the one which led to imprisonment. The average age of inmates

in state and federal prisons is 26.7 years. In federal prisons, almost one-fourth of the inmates are between the ages of 24 and 27 and half are under 30 years of age. Prison populations are also predominately male with only five percent being female. Inmates of correctional institutions may also be described as educationally deprived. Of the nearly 20,000 federal prisoners surveyed, 28 percent had completed eight years of schooling or less and 37 percent had completed high school. The educational level of inmates in state prisons is lower than the educational levels of the general American population.

As a group, offenders come from low socioeconomic backgrounds with incarceration taking place in such a way that additional severe disabilities are placed upon offenders by removing them from society and isolating them from generally available community services which aim to fulfill educational and social needs of the deprived. Additionally, inmates are given the discriminatory and pejorative label of ex-con. In short, prisons accentuate the tendency of offenders to remain in lower socioeconomic classes.

Now let's take a look at the cost of operating correctional systems. When including all of the juveniles, adult felons, adult misdemeanants, and those on parole, the institutions which provide the service to these more than 1.2 million offenders cost an annual average of slightly more than one billion dollars. It is difficult to describe costs accurately because of averaging, but it is clear that over four-fifths of the funds spent in corrections are spent on the one-third of the offenders who are incarcerated.

One other element of great importance in considering the potential benefit of vocational education for offenders who can profit from it is the environment in which such instruction must take place. It is my feeling that the custody-oriented institution is not a particularly good place for offering

vocational education because it results in a debilitating prison atmosphere; it is one in which inmates are given meaningless work assignments if they are lucky; but if they are not, they are simply confined to cells due to the lack of available work or recreation programs. In hostile environments, inmates fear for their personal safety and suffer humiliating loss of privacy and must undergo severe disciplinary restrictions for the sake of administrative and custodial expediency. In such an environment, inmates exercise none of the responsibilities which form an integral part of life outside the institution. As a result of all these factors and experiences inherent in security-oriented institutions, many former inmates believe that they are incapable of functioning in society and may, in fact, become less capable as a result of this environment. Hence, such an environment is most likely not conducive to learning. It is very clear to me that vocational education must take place in an environment where the likelihood of success is present.

As a part of the oversight hearings on vocational education last summer, the Senate Committee asked questions concerning the extent to which vocational education was provided to those housed in correctional institutions. The Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education conducted a survey to obtain up-to-date information on this question. Findings indicated that, based on expenditures and enrollments in Fiscal Year 1973, programs supported in part by funds from the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, provided vocational education to nearly 40,000 offenders with states and localities providing 70 percent of the cost. The combined federal/state/local expenditures were nearly 15 million dollars at an average of $376.00 per offender served. Approximately one-fourth of the states reported no offenders served with vocational education programs, but on the other hand 12 states served more than

1,000 offenders each. It should be very clear from this survey that vocational education for offenders has not been a high priority for state agencies who conduct vocational education for persons residing in their state.

So where do we go from here. First, I believe we must come to believe that even though few persons, relatively speaking, are incarcerated in prisons, this issue deals less with numbers than the actual benefits to society for a modest investment. The effect of providing job training and job opportunities for persons who are released from prisons is certainly very cost effective because it not only provides a tax-paying contributing member of society; it removes the negative cost of housing that person as a complete expense for society. Administrators of prisons and school systems must acknowledge and believe that it is highly important to provide high quality instruction to those who are incarcerated and are about to be released. Without that high priority, all the rest of our discussions become purely rhetorical.

There are numerous models one can identify where prison officials have cooperated with education agencies in establishing and maintaining good programs of vocational education for offenders. Perhaps the most useful are those using the work release--cooperative arrangement where offenders are released to be trained on the job through an arrangement with a cooperating employer, but under the sponsorship of the school.

This not only affords less expensive vocational education and job training experiences, it provides an opportunity for the offender to regain his confidence in dealing with society on a part-time basis preparing him for eventual full-time release.

There are limitations which must, however, be recognized. The low level educational attainment of offenders that I spoke about previously greatly changes

the instructional requirements. Basic education is often required as a part of or as a prerequisite to vocational education. Frequently, offenders cannot profit from vocational instruction because they simply do not have the functioning skills which enable learning to take place.

While these are obstacles, most are not insurmountable. In the State of Oklahoma, the state legislature appropriates funds to the State Board for Vocational Education to conduct vocational education for offenders. All their programs are conducted "inside" for offenders soon to be released. Eighty-three percent complete the instruction and 85 percent of the completers are placed in jobs as a result of the career preparation. So in spite of problems, it can be done and done well.

Finally, I believe we are entering a new era of cooperation with involved agencies at all levels to create vital new opportunities for offenders who through more readily accessible vocational education will be able to prepare for successful employment in an occupation, thus having a ready, salable skill which can be the key to economic and personal success. Our agency is pleased to be a part of this new effort.

APPENDIX E

SELECTED WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS AND REACTIONS

These addresses were presented at the Workshop to Improve Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions at The Center for Vocational Education of The Ohio State University, October 28-31, 1975. They received limited editing by the project staff.

"How Do We Develop the Role of
Vocational Education in Corrections"

Sherwood Dees, Assistant Superintendent
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Illinois Office of Education
Springfield, Illinois

It is an honor to represent the Illinois Office of Education and the Division of Vocational and Technical Education in making this presentation on "How Do We Develop the Role of Vocational Education in Corrections."

We feel that we were selected to make this presentation because of the development of comprehensive programs for the world of work in cooperation with the Illinois Department of Corrections. We have developed the same types of programs that meet the needs of the wards of the State for the Department of Children and Family Services and the Department of Mental Health.

A close working relationship must be developed by the Department of Corrections and the State educational agency. In Illinois, the development of this cooperative team activity was the result in large part of the effort and assistance of Director Allyn R. Sielaff of the Department of Corrections and his staff, as well as the Board of Education of the Department of Corrections School District No. 428 and Superintendent J. Clark Esarey. This spirit and cooperation is also evident in the role of CETA and Director Joan Wills of the Governor's Office of Manpower Planning, the Correctional Manpower Services Project and Director Edmund H. Muth, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Director Eugene Turner, the Illinois Community College Board and Executive Secretary Fred Wellman, and the Illinois Office of Education and Superintendent Joseph M. Cronin and the Department of Adult

and Continuing Education and Director Wayne Giles. Individual school and community college districts are included as team members in this effort. Cooperation is a state of mind, cannot be legislated and can only be accomplished by a spirit of mutual understanding committed toward assistance to individuals in training for the world of work--the highest priority in all of education today.

The change in D.V.T.E. policy to provide funding and technical assistance began as a result of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These Amendments placed special emphasis on the disadvantaged and handicapped persons needing vocational education programs. These Amendments placed the emphasis on the needs of individuals rather than on specific occupational programs of past Federal vocational education legislation. The Amendments even require a certain percentage of Federal funds (25 percent) to be spent for the disadvantaged and handicapped. This requirement was directed at a special problem that vocational education historically developed to screen out students with these special needs. In many states this screening process developed in agriculture in that expensive projects such as a purebred animal or a certain acreage for crop production were necessary for an approved project. Another device still being used to screen students is the prerequisite requirement for admission to some vocational education programs.

In 1969, Illinois took a new look at vocational education within the State and developed a new flexible State Plan that included all possible delivery systems for vocational training including the Illinois Departments of Corrections, Mental Health, and Children and Family Services. For the

first time, the Division of Vocational and Technical Education included the wards of the State as eligible for vocational education programs on the same basis as public school and community college districts. In fact, the inmates of institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections were considered to be under the highest priority of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and we felt mandated to provide special services for these individuals who need vocational education the most.

The administrative structure of D.V.T.E. in Illinois should be clearly understood. Historically since 1918, the Division has been administered by a single State Board appointed by the Governor with the Superintendent of Public Instruction serving as Executive Officer. This State Board is also administratively in charge of vocational rehabilitation. The Division is now becoming a part of the Illinois Office of Education under the State Board of Education, which has charge of elementary, secondary and vocational education. Illinois has a decentralized school and community college system with 1,039 school districts, 40 community college districts and two technical institutes affiliated with State universities.

The Division does not administer vocational education programs directly but contracts with the public schools, community colleges and state agencies, including the Department of Corrections, to provide the training needed by individuals to enter or upgrade themselves for the world of work. The Division does not provide full funding for the cost of vocational training--only a portion of the differential cost is reimbursed. Actually, D.V.T.E. considers its role as the agent on the cutting edge of education to change and promote improvements in skill training. This cutting edge assists local and

state agencies to plan, operate, fund, evaluate and coordinate vocational and technical education programs. This cutting edge includes a close working relationship with practically every public school and community college district, 20 Prime sponsors under the CETA program, and some 13 other state agencies.

In 1969, D.V.T.E. initiated a State Interagency Committee that met once a month to coordinate and assist in providing educational services to wards of the state. One person was designated by the Director of each state agency to serve on this interagency committee with Bernard Quigley of D.V.T.E. serving as chairman. After a year of monthly meetings, it was found that it was not legal for one state agency to contract with another state agency. We were instrumental in having legislation passed to change this restriction so that one state agency can fund another state agency by a contractual agreement. This was the beginning of D.V.T.E. contracting with other state agencies and, at first, funding was limited to State agencies that did not have funds in their own budget and needed D.V.T.E. funding to initiate a new program which could meet the criteria of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. In the first year (1971), D.V.T.E. contracted for $251,491 with the Department of Corrections but only $133,530 was spent. In this first year, special emphasis was placed on program development, including new programs started and funded by D.V.T.E., but also including the programs being solely conducted by the Department of Corrections. This interaction of vocational education specialists with the correctional staff resulted in developing realistic vocational education programs within the correctional setting. D.V.T.E. contracted with

community colleges to conduct vocational programs within the correctional facility. At times, these contracts were part of a three- or four-party contractual agreement involving not only the correctional facility and community college district but also the Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Illinois Department of Corrections. The Illinois State Employment Service designated staff positions to assist in the screening and placement of individuals.

Initially, little vocational guidance and counseling in the correctional setting was available; the assignment committee generally was made up of guard captains, a clinical person and one administrator. When contracting with a community college, a vocational coordinator or guidance counselor was employed to assist individuals in enrolling in meaningful courses. Later, under the Manpower Development and Training Act, a special contract provided for a vocational counseling program in each correctional facility. This program is now entirely funded by the Department of Corrections.

After the initial year, each correctional facility was required to submit an annual one- and five-year occupational education plan--the same as required of public schools and community colleges. One section of this plan required the establishment of a budget listing internal as well as external resources. It also assisted the newly formed correctional school district to establish a budget from General Revenue funds earmarked for both general and vocational education. This plan also listed all vocational programs and courses whether they were funded by D.V.T.E., community colleges, the correctional school district, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, or private training schools. By carefully preparing this

one- and five-year plan, a total vocational education program in the correctional institution is mandated and, if funds are limited, top priorities can be established.

D.V.T.E. has developed a unique three-phase evaluation system that has received national recognition and which has proven to be very influential in improving the quality of the programs. The first phase of this system is preparing and submitting a one- and five-year contractual plan. Phase II provides for the approval of the plan by D.V.T.E. Phase III is an on-site team evaluation comprised of a leader, representatives of business and industry and a former vocational student. The on-site evaluation team does not include members of D.V.T.E. staff, but the team leader must have completed a very comprehensive training program for this assignment. This on-site evaluation program is conducted for the public schools and community colleges as well as for the Department of Corrections. The only difference in the evaluation teams is that the personnel on the respective teams are selected for their interest and experience in the program being evaluated.

Following the evaluation, the correctional institution must react to each recommendation and set a time schedule to implement each reaction before the next one- and five-year plan is approved for funding for the next year.

Officials of the Department of Corrections report that D.V.T.E. assistance in planning and evaluation has been of even greater help than that of providing additional funds. Generally, correctional staffs do not include the vocational education specialists in consultant services for the occupational areas nor have the expertise in planning and evaluation. One member

of D.V.T.E. staff, Bernard Quigley, provides full-time service as liaison between the Division and the State agencies. He is a most competent person who is committed to helping these wards of the State.

The Department of Corrections in Illinois is divided into the Juvenile Division and the Adult Division. Following is a summarization of D.V.T.E. funding from 1971 through 1975, and a list of vocational education programs in operation in 1974. You will note the emphasis placed on skill training programs.

A SUMMARY OF D.V.T.E. SUPPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - FY '71 - '75

Division	Facilities	Programs	Funds	Enrollment
Juvenile	12	37	$1,164,695	5,237
Adult	9	76	$1,008,622	4,213
Totals	21	113	$2,173,317	9,450

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
JUVENILE DIVISION
EXISTING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

FACILITY	PROGRAM	ENROLLMENT
ISTSB, St. Charles	Automotive Services	4
	Body and Fender Repair	11
	Auto Mechanics	0
	Welding	12
	Small Engine	8
	Careers Training	10
	Barber College	11
	Horticulture and Landscaping	13
	Work Experience	53
	General Vocational Preparation	
ISTSG, Geneva	Key Punch	5
	Nurses Training	11
	Career Education Instruction	20
	Cosmetology	11
	Work Experience	30
	Cooperative Vocational Education	1

Valley View	Pre-Vocational Orientation and Guidance Program	30
Hanna City	WECEP	8
	Skills Exposure and Trained Laboratory Experience Program	33
DuPage	WECEP	10
Pere Marquette	Vocational Survey	10
	Pre-Vocational Skills Course	7
	Cooperative Education	25
Special Services	AYD Vocational	30
Mississippi Palisades		
Kankakee	Auto Mechanics	12
	Welding	12
Dixon Springs	Air Conditioning	9
	Industrial Electronics	9
Channahon	WECEP	15
VAST	Related Information Class	9
	Pre-Vocational Study	9

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
ADULT DIVISION
EXISTING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

FACILITY	PROGRAM	ENROLLMENT
Vandalia	Building Maintenance	8
	Hospital Attendant	
	Welding	15
	Auto Body Repair	13
Dwight	Secretarial Training	15
	Beauty Culture	5
Stateville	Accounting/Data Processing	41
	Automotive Service	41
	Culinary Arts	17
	Printing	9
	Barber Training	80
	Auto Mechanics	4

	Auto Body & Fender	1
	Business Machine Repair	2
	Welding	1
	Masonry	3
	TV Repair	4
Pontiac	Mechanical Design Technology	42
	Mechanical Production Technology	25
	Automotive Service	35
	Culinary Arts	27
	Barber Training	11
	Printing	12
	Refrigeration	4
	Radio/TV Repair	4
	Welding	18
	Drafting	18
Menard	Welding	17
	Machine Drafting	15
	Job Orientation	19
	Business Machine Repair	9
	Sign Painting	3
	Drafting	8
	Watch & Clock Repair	3
	Laundering	33
	Electricity	6
	Electronics	9
	Graphic Arts	8
	Business Occupations	19
	Barber Training	20
	Heavy Equipment	35
	Woodworking	8
	Metal Work	5
	Welding	4
Menard Pshch.	Clerk Typist	5
	Short Order Cook	24
Sheridan	Auto Shop	13
	Body & Fender	14
	Welding	14
	Shoe Repair	10
	Masonry	10
	Meat Cutting	9
	Barber Shop	10
	Pin Setter Mechanics	32
Vienna	Barber School	14
	Emergency Medical Technician	26
	Machine Tool Operator	14

Water/Waste Technician	15
Mechanical Drafting	17
Welding	32
Ornamental Horticulture	5
Auto Mechanics	17
Industrial Electricity	15
Food Service	20
Surveyor	11

A careful evaluation of correctional vocational education programs notes a high degree of coordination with all agencies involved in such programs. A Report on the Manpower Needs of Law Offenders in Illinois has been prepared by Edmund H. Muth and other task force members from eight state agencies. Illinois has developed a Corrections Manpower Services Project for placement of law offenders with all county and city officials working cooperatively together. A placement office in each of the 12 major metro areas of the state has been established to secure information such as the kind of work former inmates are getting, salaries, time for clients to be placed, retention on the job, etc. All information is computerized at very minimal cost. State funds of $1,750,000 have been committed by the Departments of Corrections and Law Enforcement and the Governor's share (4 percent) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act while the U. S. Department of Labor provides $270,000. We understand that this is the largest placement effort in the United States for law offenders, and it is all inclusive of offenders from correctional institutions and those referred by state attorneys, probation officers, judges, and others.

D.V.T.E. specializes in its emphasis on the skill training as a part of the total vocational education program. Some of the Governor's 4 percent CETA funds provides orientation programs that will later lead to the skill training programs funded by D.V.T.E., the public schools and community colleges.

Correctional institutions in Illinois range in type from the minimum security facility at Vienna to the maximum security facility at Joliet. Vocational education programs are offered at all types of correctional institutions. Actually, the Vienna Correctional Center, a minimum security facility, was built with vocational programs for residents as the major focus and objective. Manpower Development and Training funds established this most comprehensive vocational education program administered by the Shawnee Community College. Some correctional officials claim that the Vienna Center offers the most comprehensive quality vocational education programs of any correctional facility in the United States.

We look upon the D.V.T.E. role as providing the seed money for improvement and expansion of vocational education in correction facilities. This seed money, along with the others previously listed, the Veterans Administration, the Department of Public Aid, the Department of Labor, the Correctional Manpower Services Project and private funds have expanded state correctional programs including the Cook County (Chicago) Jail. This seed money that was provided on a special contractual basis has now been changed to the same support for public schools and community colleges.

D.V.T.E. did not alone provide a new emphasis on quality vocational education programs in correctional institutions. It has been a team effort with many involved and cooperation from all. Expertise within the State has been harnessed to work together toward a common goal. There is no fighting to "protect the turf" of a State agency. <u>The commitment to assist others in this highest priority in all of education must be the prevailing influence to provide quality vocational education programs for those who need it most--the inmates of correctional institutions</u>.

"How Do We Meet the Needs of Students?"

William E. Monroe, Vocational Program Coordinator
Windham School District
Huntsville, Texas

Our purpose this morning is to bring into focus some problems and needs of the student in correctional vocational education. From yesterday's comments, I can only assume we are familiar with Dr. Martinson's report. We will not ride that horse to death this morning. I am sure you also have some knowledge of the GAO report issued in August of this year dealing with the lack of sufficient data upon which to evaluate the effectiveness of certain programs. Some face was saved when Texas was not included in that report--our own research through follow-up has produced similar results. As a sometime researcher, it is disconcerting to be involved in a project of evaluation where emotional involvement transcends objectivity.

After your project is completed and you sit with your world shattered, you begin to ask yourself some questions. The first and foremost one is the same one you as middle class parents would ask if your child had failed your expectations: "Where did we go wrong?" We have gone wrong--as educators, as administrators, and more basically, as honest, fairminded human beings. Vocational education in corrections must be placed in the same category as most other types of people-changer programs in corrections. By and large, it has not solved the problem nor has it met the needs of the students. Why can't we look to vocational education as the answer we KNOW it could be? I feel we have failed to look at the problem from a realistic viewpoint; we have looked only at the anticipated results.

Some of the problems and needs, as I see them, relate directly to the

definition of the term, "vocational education." Even in this setting we struggle with the semantics of what we are all about. Think about the inmate who is supposed to be the recipient of those services.

Secondly, we don't know enough about the process of the motivation of inmates to meet their needs. We can look about this room and see various forms of motivation to this session. We see hangovers, sleepers and some truly dedicated committed persons. We are the lucky ones. Whether or not we are interested we are motivated extrinsically because we have a paycheck waiting when we get home. We also have peer approval. We have "strokes" to motivate us. But--what of the prisoner?

We must admit that most prisons do little to motivate positively. They sometimes destroy what little motivation a person may have at incarceration in order to accomplish institutional goals or meet inmate cultural demands. What do we as educators do about that? We have a conference and talk about it. Hopefully, this conference will have different outcomes. We may be able to do something about trying to understand the motivational aspects of vocational education.

Thirdly, we lack a degree of personal involvement with our students. In all too many instances, we look at our inmates as so much fodder for the mill. Obsessed by formulae for funding, we attempt to maximize ADA and statistics by signing up, selecting students or placing them in training programs with little or no regard for their wants, needs, or capabilities.

Further, we do not have standardized testing procedures with which to "diagnose" our inmates' problems and needs. We use instruments that are biased, both from the standpoint of ethnicity and of totality of culture.

While we are on the subject of culture--and I feel the inmate to be a member of a definite culture--no one in this gathering would ever consider requesting funds from the Federal Government to study the American Indian Tribal Council without staffing the project with American Indians. What do we do in correctional programs? We could count on the fingers of one hand the numbers of projects in corrections where even a modicum of input from the offender is received--felt to be needed. Whites, we have found, cannot successfully administer programs for Blacks without Black participation. Does not the same rationale hold in our offender programs? For the most part, non-offenders have difficulty understanding the dynamics or the constitutionality of the offender.

A sixth problem exists in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor skill areas. Most of us, Texas included, excel in the cognitive and psychomotor domains. We in Texas offer some 30-odd differing programs in some of the finest vocational facilities in the nation. But, we virtually neglect the affective domain. We equate vocational training or skill acquisition with rehabilitation and we do little to nothing to change the inmates' basic attitudes toward the world of work.

If you can accept a definition of an attitude as a tendency to react in a pre-determined manner to a given stimuli, then just as you reach down each morning and tie your right shoelace and then your left, you can teach and educate attitudes. You make individual choices based on knowledge, experience and training coupled with attitudes and values; but we have known or assumed for a long time there are some deficient attitude and value systems at work in the offender population. What we need is evaluation of attitude change research

and its active implementation in corrections. Even in the area of psychomotor skill areas, we must ask ourselves if we are meeting the students' needs.

When an automotive body repair shop has one automobile on which to work and seven times the automobile is smashed and rebuilt, does that create pride and dignity in task accomplishment? We need to have products on which students can work resulting in a completed product in which some degree of personal pride and involvement can be felt. Why do we have to adapt in prisons and teach adaptation, when we attempt to accomplish just the opposite in the free world?

Finally, where does vocational education begin and end? We hear about skill training, placement, employment and life skills acquisition. But, where has the thrust of our investigative work been? . . . mainly in the area of employer satisfaction with employee. What about the ex-student/offender on the job? Does the inmate upon release have any different problems than you and I on any new job? I don't think so. I think he has to adjust to his world just as we adjust to our world of work. If we are not happy in our jobs, we move on. But what of our "statistical inmate"? When he moves he usually leaves behind a disgruntled employer and dried up a source of jobs for our trainees. Perhaps a real need is post-release or aftercare support.

Some years ago a little girl named Kathy was down in a well. For three days an entire community rallied to get this child out of the well. When the ordeal was over, $1,300,000 had been spent and the child was dead. The participants were questioned and almost to the man, they would have repeated the ordeal under similar circumstances. We in corrections are in the same boat. We are faced with the possibility of failure in every one of our inmates, but yet we continue to work, to meet together, in an attempt to solve the problems

with which we are faced. The time has come for accountability. The time has come when we must face the problems in a realistic manner and understand the people with whom we work, instead of sitting on the mountain top and pontificating what we think is the way, the truth and the light.

Our inmates are here in greater numbers than ever before. In our own department we had a net gain of 250 in 1974. In the first ten months of 1975 we have a net gain of 1,643. They are coming in greater numbers and leaving in lesser numbers. We must restructure our programs and even our systems of delivery. We must produce people who do not return to the penitentiary, and we must produce people who can walk the streets and not commit crimes.

Vocational education is a viable alternative. It is an answer to part of the problem . . . only if it is realistic. And if it is realistic, it is something the inmate can take and use. He can put his head back, his chest out and feel like he has done a good job when he has finished. I think today we may be beginning the journey to accomplishing that goal. Thank you.

"How Do We Meet the Needs of Students of Vocational Education in Corrections?"

Euphesenia W. Foster, Education and Special Projects Officer
U. S. Justice Department, Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

In the absence of Charles Lankford, it is my privilege to address the topic "How Do We Meet the Needs of Students of Vocational Education in Corrections?"

The U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons has placed me on "detail" to the U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, to coordinate all activities relating to women offenders during International Women's Year (IWY). The Women's Bureau has had a long involvement with women offender concerns, especially vocational educational and employment needs. Carmen R. Maymi, Director, Women's Bureau initiated a program for IWY to call attention to these needs of women offenders and to encourage people to provide for them a balanced system of supportive services in their communities. The year 1975 has been proclaimed IWY, a year of intensified action to advance the status of all women. Since one of the specific objectives of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women is "Seeking to improve the situation of women in prison and other places of detention," IWY provides an excellent forum for beginning this program. I feel, then, that this provides me with an excellent opportunity to address the needs of women students in the vocational education corrections setting.

The most frequently given reason for ignoring women in corrections is that there are not very many of them. As Virginia McArthur pointed out in

a monograph funded by the Manpower Administration[1], although women make up a slight majority of the adult population, only one out of seven of the 6.5 million people arrested in 1970 was a woman, and only one in 19 in jail awaiting trial was a woman. Of offenders who have been tried and sentenced, only one in 22 is a woman; and because they serve shorter sentences, only one in 35 in the prison population on a given day is a woman.

In terms of total numbers, as opposed to proportions, the Census Bureau found about 6,400 women serving sentences in state and federal prisons when it conducted a special survey on the question in 1970; at the same time it counted about 4,000 women housed in local or county jails, either awaiting trial or serving shorter sentences.

The disproportionate number of women in corrections complicates the always difficult question of providing for their vocational education needs. How can a prison offer a range of vocational education programs if it has a relatively small population? In 1971, for instance, a survey showed that of the state prisons for women, only those in California, New York, and Ohio had more than 150 residents. Some states have so few female prisoners that they don't have a women's facility at all; they "ship" those with more than brief sentences to other states, or to federal institutions, thus removing them that much farther from their families and friends. The most extreme case is that of Hawaii, which sends women drawing more than two years to California to serve their time.

In a not so unusual manner, vocational education programs in women's

---

[1]The monograph, FROM CONVICT TO CITIZEN: PROGRAMS FOR THE WOMAN OFFENDER, D. C. Commission on the Status of Women, 14th & E Sts., Washington, D.C. 20004.

prisons have tended to reflect both a traditional attitude toward women in the work force and the "ladylike" sort of work for those with criminal records. Typically, what passes for vocational education is a mixture of some remedial education, some skill training in traditional female occupations such as food preparation, garment making, and practical nursing, and a great deal of low-paid or nonpaid "work experience" programs. These, however, are programs designed more to benefit the institution than they are to resocialize the confined individual. There are chores to be done and somebody has to do them. Cooking the food, washing the dishes, and mowing the lawn consume a major portion of inmate energies.

Due to the "growth" of prison industries, much of the resident's time is spent producing goods for other segments of government. Male prisoners generally produce license plates and often make furniture for use by state agencies. Women may make garments or, as in New Jersey, string mops. Educational programs in women's institutions tend to be less varied and more limited than in men's institutions, largely because of factors of scale. Female prisoners, like their male counterparts, are generally from poverty backgrounds and have low levels of educational attainment. For most women who enter a prison where there are both vocational education opportunities and prison industries, a choice has to be made. The decision to work in prison industries to earn a few pennies inevitably wins out as opposed to taking advantage of opportunities to enhance educational achievements.

Women in today's world have about the same need to work as men. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, two out of every five persons in the labor force 16 years and over were women (40.2 percent). Recent studies show that 70 percent to 80 percent of the women offenders have children in

many cases dependent upon them for support. Various studies that have focused on resocialization of offenders have concluded that a key element in avoiding the "revolving door" is a job.

In meeting the needs of students of vocational education in corrections, we must begin to accept that student where he or she is. Are out institutions structured so that they serve the needs of the institution, rather than the institution serving the needs of the students? Do we ever discuss the non-violent offense in terms of vocational education goals? It is the thinking of some that the criminal is sick and can be cured by certain treatment procedures or program exposures and released back into society cured. Nobody has control over a person's attitudes. You can't change a person's attitudes. As vocational educators, we cannot change the attitudes of our students. What is needed are programs to develop independent thinking individuals who then become responsible, positive or negative, for their own decisions. Our programs need to reflect the awareness that our students' needs will be met, with or without our help. Preparation then begins for them to go back into society to their own life style, giving and demanding the same to others.

Corrections has recognized the resocialization needs to a greater extent for male than for female offenders. For example, male prisoners often have a wider variety of job-training or job-readiness training options available within the institution. Work release is more readily available to them than to women. Half-way houses offer the male offender a base in an urban setting from which he can obtain work; females often have no access to such transitional facilities. Supportive services in the community are often not available to women offenders or, when they are, they do not address their

special or unique needs. Women usually have more difficulty re-entering the community and obtaining a job because the stigma of having served time appears greater for a woman than a man.

Recognizing this background of need and neglect, the Women's Bureau set forth these objectives for its women offender IWY program:

(1) To identify and assess the needs and problems of women offenders both in the institution and in the community as they relate to employment.

(2) To share information with the citizenry and with the appropriate governmental and private agencies about the employment needs of women offenders. To seek closer coordination among agencies which provide services and to establish an ongoing network of communication among them.

(3) To act as a catalyst in encouraging all segments of the community --voluntary agencies, governmental and private agencies in the criminal justice or related fields, unions, employers, educators, legislatures, etc., to develop a plan of action to improve the services relating to employment and employability of women offenders.

These objectives are being carried out in projects in Baltimore, Maryland, and Miami, Florida. A consultation was sponsored by the Women's Bureau October 15 at the Maryland Correctional Institution for Women (MCIW), Jessup, Maryland. Linkages of all segments of the community as mentioned in number three above was an important element along with participation of staff and approximately 20 residents of MCIW. Follow-up action has led to the formation of a new alliance of community and institution persons to implement the

plan of action from the consultation. The Miami project is scheduled for March 1976.

In conclusion, as vocational educators in corrections, we need to open up the lines of communications with each other. Then stress this with prison industries, case management, food service, maintenance--right on down the line. Our students are total people with total needs. Vocational education programs for females must also reflect totality of needs. We must stop advocating the theory of programming that women are dependent creatures and society is going to look after them. What is needed are social and coping skills, including family life education and consumer training to prepare them to deal with society without reliance on a public welfare system or on a temporary male guardian (a new boy-friend, until he gets broke) or some other "crutch," No longer will our theory of Sir Galahad riding in on a white horse or a black one for that matter, "swooping" her up and riding into the distance suffice. She'll not rear lots of children while he slays the dragon and takes care of her every whim. There is no "living peacefully and happily ever after." We can't teach our women students this theory and get away with it. In fact, we've probably got enough returning students who don't believe it either. The key to strong vocational education in corrections for females as well as male offenders is a focus in our programming on self-definition, self-realization, self-appreciation, and self-sufficiency.

"Reaction to Presentations by William Monroe and Euphesenia Foster"

Sherman Day, Director
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

One thing is evident in both presentations preceding this reaction--affect or feeling is a very important ingredient in correctional personnel. I'd like to react to three or four issues that were raised by Bill and Euphey and then a couple of issues that I'd like to raise. First of all, in terms of the issue of vocational education or non-vocational education, I guess we've all got to make our own little comment about this issue because we all feel some urgency to defend what we're doing. I would merely say that I don't think that the dichotomy is a real issue. I feel we're going to continue to have vocational education, and I think it's going to be a viable tool.

I believe the only problem is going to be how it might be delivered. If you ask the average man on the street, and this has been done, about providing special food in prisons, most of them are against it. If you ask the average person on the street about swimming pools and large gymnasiums, the average person is against them. If you ask the average man on the street about providing an education or skill, I think the average person is for this issue, because of an economics view if not human decency. Therefore, I think the issue across the criminal justice system is not whether we'll have vocational education but how we can improve vocational education. While we have heard some reports in this conference about some very fine systems and some very fine programs in individual institutions, any report that I have read tells me it's lacking, it's unrealistic, it's not relevant, and in many cases it's out dated.

In terms of the vocational education again, I think it's gaining even more momentum while some of the other "treatment" approaches are diminishing. The indications across the country are that people are less taken to self-improvement by counseling and therapy or what is often terms called the soft approaches and at the same time placing more emphasis on the harder approaches to programming like vocational education or skill development.

In terms of meeting student needs beyong the previous points, let me just mention four points that I think are critical. I believe these complement the issues raised by the two previous speakers. One is flexibility. I don't think there is any question but that we need to look at increased flexibility in terms of staff, space, programs alternatives and delivering systems in vocational education. One of the problems with vocational education across the country is the fact that we tend to think of the two or three trade areas found in almost every institution; welding, automechanics, body repair, etc., etc., and these have been kind of bread and butter programs in vocational education. However, in the world of work there are literally thousands of available jobs that require some kinds of vocational training. I think we're going to have to think in terms of smaller scale programs which might mean differing space and time arrangements. In some of the groups reporting this morning it was mentioned that perhaps one of our problems is building large shops, etc. Maybe the best thing to do is build a cover, or shell, and let people from the community bring programs in as they're relevant. I don't think any of us realized five years ago what the impact would be of small motor repairs and motorcycles. So rather than predict, I think we need to build in as much flexibility as possible and allow the community resources to assist us in

providing quality programs.

The second point deals with the issue that the quantity and quality of programs ought to be interchangeable with local communities. This is one that we must look at seriously because quality in all of our programs has been evaluated as lacking. It doesn't take a great deal of intelligence to tell the difference between a quality program or a non-quality program. Offenders are super sensitive to being mistreated, to being victims of the system and are extremely able to distinquish phony programs. We have a level of sophistication that means our youngest offenders know when programs are phony and they're not meeting their needs.

The third point deals with one that both Euphey and Bill hit hard, i.e., alternatives and choices within the system and more importantly who makes the choices. Basically we counsel offenders from our frame of reference, we're coming from our experience, we're coming from our view of the world and our realism. The only way to deal with realism in prison is from the offender reference. It goes back into some of the things that have been mentioned earlier in Ken Carpenter's talk, and Norval Morris' writings. It ties in very closely with Bill's point about motivation. All of these things are tightly related to choice. If I chose the program, motivation increases. If you choose for me, I make no commitment. It's a known fact that if high school counselors discourage a kid from going to college, yet the students decided to go--his chances of success are great. The real point is just how well we can judge for other people what is relevant and what is real. This doesn't mean that we won't have some hard choices about realistic job opportunities.

The fourth point that I would like to address relates to Euphey's comments regarding whose needs are we really meeting? Now this section of the program

dwells basically and entirely on the student needs and so we can go overboard in stressing student needs since management's needs and industry's needs and others' needs are discussed in other sections of this program or in other programs. We in corrections have definitely been remiss in not considering the offender's needs when it comes to programming, and perhaps the thing that's most at fault and the thing we need to look at is the schedule of average institutional time. There's no opportunity for more flexibility than the schedule of an offender. They don't have to catch a bus, they don't have to get home to be there when the kids are there. They don't have to worry about being out late at night. He or she is going to be there 24 hours a day, and it's time we started looking at different modules of scheduling that day so competition with industries, other kinds of self-help programs, recreation or privacy is diminished. I think that perhaps the group here could address the program of flexibility scheduling. I know some institutions across the country are now looking at breaking up the day in terms of four-hour modules as opposed to the traditional work day from seven to four, or eight to five. Certainly that flexibility is possible since the offenders are available.

Perhaps the most important thing about the conference is that we have an opportunity to discuss vocational education problems with a wide range of people. We have correctional managers, we have three or four heads of major systems in the country, we have heads of professional organizations, we have vocational educators, we have people from business, we have people from the private sector. Perhaps it's time we got together at least at this conference, where there is time, to discuss whose needs are we really to meet in scheduling the day's activities.

In summary, the problems are large and opportunity for improvement monumental.

"Reactions to Presentations by
William Monroe and Euphesenia Foster"

Ruth M. Glick, Director
National Study on Women's Correctional Programs
Berkeley, California

One of the items that Bill mentioned as being extremely important is having the offender involved in planning programs, especially in assessing needs. Though many of you plan programs only for males, you have a responsibility to help plan programs for the female offender as well. Because there are so few female offenders and so few institutions to house them, they are often totally neglected. I would add, as a word of caution, that females should be involved in planning programs for females.

For the last year, I have been working on a study of programs and services for the female offender. The study has focused upon 13 states and has included a review of programs in the major correctional institution of each state. The review of local jail programs in counties over 250,000 and community-based programming for the female offender is also included in the project activity. I would like to call your attention to the fact that while other studies indicate vocational training programs exist here or there, they neglect to report that few women are actually enrolled in any of those programs.

The current trend towards co-educational programs has been justified by pointing out that the female offender can participate in more programs including those designed traditionally for males. However, current attitudes, beliefs and values need to be considered before such decisions are made. Women are taught to define themselves in our society in terms of males. When we have girls fail in the elementary school, no one worries too much. But when those failures are boys, that is cause to worry because we all know that males have

to go out and work. It's a very common thing that when you meet a male you say to him, "What do you do?" When you meet a female, you say, "What does your husband do?" A woman is defined first as a mother or wife (in whichever order, it doesn't seem to matter nowadays), and secondly, perhaps, in terms of her job, but with the understanding always that she shouldn't be competing with her husband. Women believe that. One of the problems with getting women to become involved in vocational or educational programs in the coed setting is that they have learned beautifully not to compete with the male. With all of the range of program options open to them, perhaps one woman takes an electronics course, or two women go into the shop course in auto mechanics. Because women are smart, not only do they know that they shouldn't do too well in the program, they know that they won't be thought of too highly by the men around them. When they get out, they also know that they are going to have a tough time making it in those occupations. As much as I would like to think that all women are going to opt for non-traditional jobs, it just isn't true. Women lack support groups around them and our study found that the women are opting for very traditional training programs.

In the comments that we got from some of the women, we asked them what the best job was that they ever had and what job they aspired to if they could have any job they wanted. One woman wrote that she had been a clerk in an office and the best job that she could ever have would be as a secretary in a nice office. And that's moving up. There is a lot more upward mobility in some of the clerical services than we'd like to believe. I think part of the problem is that women have been putting other women down and saying women shouldn't be secretaries. Nonsense! If that's what a woman wants to be, those training programs ought to be available. I sometimes think that as we

open up areas like nursing to males, women need to look very carefully to see what is happening to the male nurses. Although they are having a difficult time completing school in all female programs, they're promoted immediately into supervisory roles when they get out.

I'd like to comment specifically on some of the statements that Bill made. The question of motivation in our society in terms of work is most often extrinsic--it's money. But many women can net more on welfare than they can in the jobs that are available to them. Besides, if a woman opt for welfare, she gets to be a good mother, since society defines a good mother as one who stays home with her children. Now the paradox is that we're trying to deal with the female offender who has the role model that a good mother stays home, but we're also telling her that if she doesn't want to be an offender, she's got to go out and work. This is an example of the conflicts that have to be dealt with in the programs. Money alone may not be the motivating factor.

In addition, women have special needs. You can train a woman to work; you can train her to take a job; but, remember, you had better train her how to hold down two jobs, because she still has to manage the house and she still has to manage the kids and she still has to shop and cook and sew and do everything else. And many of the women believe it is their responsibility to do all of these things and they're not even willing to share it with the men in their lives if, in fact, there is a man in their life to share it with. A good number of women support their families alone and never get married.

Another issue to consider is teaching methodology. You can't educate all people the same way. Many offenders are older, and the woman who is 35 or over has a good deal of life experience under her belt. She knows more about the world and you're not going to put her through a Mickey Mouse training course that some of the younger women or younger men may accept. Her life experience

must be considered. Universities that are offering older women an opportunity to come back to school are beginning to give women credit for life experience for the work that they've done in the community. When you plan programs, careful consideration should be given to age in assessing the kind of training that should be provided. We talk glibly about diagnostic tests knowing full well that they haven't ever worked for us. But one of the special issues in the institutional setting is when those tests should be given. There have been studies of stress that indicate that incarceration is one of the highest stress points in a person's life. Yet, when do we test offenders to find out their vocational aptitudes and their reading ability and their IQ and everything else?--within the first 30 days after incarceration when they couldn't care less. We need to take that into consideration when we develop testing and diagnostic programs. We need to make sure that we retest people at reasonable intervals and make sure that we're on target.

In conclusion, I want to mention one other thing about the institutional setting--the balance between the need for security and control and our stated goal of rehabilitation. One of the charges leveled at females generally is that we lack responsibility; we lack the ability to make clear choices. Yet in the process of rehabilitating women, we put them in institutions where we make every decision for them, from what they wear, to what time they get up, to what they eat, to when they put their lights out, to what they can read, and with whom they can associate. If we truly want to teach responsibility, then we need to develop some realistic ways to help people make choices while they're still incarcerated.

"The Three R's of Vocational Education in Corrections (and a Few Other Letters)"

Amos E. Reed, Administrator
Oregon Corrections Division
Salem, Oregon

This conference is called to discuss improvement in vocational education in corrections; this section is concerned with development of realistic programs. My dictionary defines improvement as "an increase in value or in excellence of quality of condition." Realistic is defined as "tending to face fact; practical rather than visionary." As I prepared for my participation in this meeting, I found myself asking, "Improvement in relation to what objectives? Realistic in relation to which facts?"

In basic education we have long recognized the "three R's" of reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic. There are several other sets of R's which must be recognized by vocational educators in the field of corrections. From the viewpoint of the general public, corrections is expected to provide full and immediate relief from the depredations of the offender. The offender is to be punished and changed in ways which will assure that he will not again offend at any time in his life. The "three R's" of corrections, as seen from the public, are revenge, restraint and reformation. The corrections professional recognizes the right of the public to reasonable protection. He also recognizes, however, that nearly all offenders sooner or later return to full participation in general society. Incarceration provides immediate public protection. But only change in the orientation of the offender and in the abilities of the offender to sustain the new orientation can provide the long-range protection of the public. The offender must be helped to convert himself into a deliberately law-abiding citizen.

To the professional corrections worker, the "three R's" of corrections must be resocialization, reintegration and rehabilitation.

The inmate is clearly aware of the punitive and confining aspects of his situation. He is at best an unwilling recipient of our attentions. Initially, he will perceive our services as the "three R's" of reprisal, restriction and regulation. He is likely to take the stand that "I'm here for rehabilitation. OK, go ahead and rehabilitate me."

If our tasks are to be accomplished with any degree of satisfaction to any of those concerned, we need to have some common agreements on objectives and methods. All of us--correctional workers, inmates and the general public--must accept some basic realities which, although they are simple and straightforward, are not clearly understood by many.

The pattern of individual orientation and behavior is set early in life, shaped in large part by the influences of family and neighborhood. This pattern is molded and refined by the individual's experiences in education and in this social and economic life of the general community. There doesn't appear to be any clear, easily identifiable "reasons" for crime; there appear to be only incompatibilities between the orientation and capacity of individuals and the requirements and freedoms of community life. Problems which develop in the community are of a nature which generally can be resolved, in the final analysis, only in the community. Corrections can provide temporary respite while initial steps are taken and can provide services and guidance which can lead to adjustment. We cannot, however, accept responsibility for actually making changes, either in the offender or in the structure of the community from which he comes and to which he must return. The best we can give is leadership and coordination for the efforts of the

offender, himself, and of those about him. The basic responsibility rests with the educational, business, labor, and social segments of the general community, and--most directly--with the individual offender.

Vocational education is one of many factors which must be considered in helping an offender make ready for law-abiding participation in our society. It is a crucial one, but it is only one. If we are to help the offender to reintegrate successfully with the community, we must remember that no matter how skilled he may be he still requires the integrity and the self-control to remain on the job and out of trouble. It has been truly pointed out that teaching a mugger to be a good carpenter produces a mugger who can work with wood. We cannot consider the offender to present a list of separate problems which can be discretely addressed; this approach has often been the one which helped lead him to become an offender. We must, instead, think of the person as a total organism--a gestalt--with closely interrelated needs, wants, abilities and potentials, acting in a dynamic, ever-changing field. Programs which will be of assistance in helping the person shift from offender to law-abiding citizen will be tailored in these terms. They will be designed to encourage and support existent strengths and skills, address and fill in areas of weakness or lack, and to find positive means of avoiding call upon areas of frank inability.

People--and offenders are people--practice the law of parsimony. To the greatest degree commensurate with the limitations internally accepted or externally imposed, people consistently seek and follow the simplest and most direct means of obtaining the things they want. To be meaningful to the individual, programs must recognize this fact and must offer obvious and direct contribution to his personal life-fulfillment goals. They must

be recognizable related to his needs and his desires. Programs which do not meet this criterion will seldom achieve their long-range objectives.

Vocational education within correctional institutions should clearly and significantly intertie with all other programs of the institution, of the correctional system, and of the general community. There must be a conscious, continuous effort to plan for and deal with the total person wherever he may be. Some schools and some institutions--far too few--assign teachers, principals, and staff to track from one to fifteen students throughout their entire progress over extended time. We're talking here about a master planning effort with the lead person taking responsibility for serving as counselor, planner and liaison for those who would otherwise drop through the interstices of our complex social and educational system. The specific task of this lead person is to help the student identify problems, become aware of their interrelationships, sort them out in manageable priority components, and follow through with a plan to address the problems and achieve desired results. The purpose of the correctional service, then, is to educate and treat the total person in terms of identified needs, helping him to work toward goals which are mutually agreed as acceptable and meaningful.

In any full-service vocational education program, there need to be five basic service functions:

1. There must be an awareness component designed to help the individual gain knowledge and understanding of just what the world of work is all about and what opportunities and demands it holds.
2. There must be an exploration component affording chances for the student to try his hand at (or at least dip his fingertips into) a

variety of general occupational areas, to "get the feel" of at least their rudimentary content.

3. There must be a skill development component permitting the trainee to obtain an in-depth knowledge of factors, practices and procedures in a specific field.
4. There must be a placement service helping the individual to locate and obtain a meaningful opportunity to make appropriate use of his newly-acquired skills and knowledge.
5. There must be a follow-up component to encourage the graduate's continuation in his chosen area and to provide feedback for any necessary modification of the program for more adequate and more meaningful services to students yet to come.

I do not mean to imply that all of these components should be brought into play with every inmate. Many individuals already have clearly saleable skills; for them, our task is to support and augment. Many individuals have a good idea of what the world of work is all about, but need specific skills to improve their position. Some require placement; others do not. It is important, however, that all components be available for those who require them. Less than full service fails the person who must start at the beginning.

In light of all of these considerations, I have difficulty perceiving the present state of vocational education in corrections as being generally adequate to the need. Looking around the country, I see many programs which are highly successful and completely appropriate. I also see programs which are woefully inadequate, badly tailored, and incorrectly oriented. Many are even self-defeating, if the purposes of correctional help to the individual

are considered at all. There are very real and compelling reasons for these situations, in many instances, but the situations nevertheless exist.

In Louisiana, sugar cane production is a basic prison industry. The money derived from this industry is used to fund other state functions. As in many other jurisdictions, the state depends upon prison industries' profit and is quite understandably reluctant to permit establishment of programs which would compete strongly for inmate manpower.

Manufacture of license plates is a prison industry in many states. In Washington, I understand, it was as recently as two years ago listed as a formal vocational training program. One wonders where graduates will find appropriate employment in the community where they may apply the skills earned in the license factory.

At Vienna, Illinois, the entire institution is involved in vocational training. An alternate campus of Shawnee College, complete with full-time faculty, library and laboratory facilities, is located on the institution grounds; half of the 400 students are members of the wider community. The programs annually include more than 100 vocational courses offered during the day, and 30 vocational and 25 academic courses given at night. Training is realistic, being identified closely with the "real world" of the general community. At Statesville there is precious little vocational education available, and that little is oriented primarily as training required for participation in prison industries.

As I have said, there are many very good reasons for the fact that so many jurisdictions have not developed realistic, goal-oriented, full-service vocational education programs. Among the most compelling of these is economics. Programs cost money. Funding of state programs, seldom lavish in any

service, has always been particularly difficult in corrections. After all, why should the public spend money for offenders when they are having difficulty funding public schools for their own children? This is a particularly strong argument today, when legislatures are having trouble in all areas, and public demand is swinging increasingly toward the hard-line "lock-'em-up-and-forget-'em" position. Additionally, prison industries are expected to make money, not only for support of institutional programs but also for support of other activities. The costs of training inmates to be productive in those industries can be partially offset by labeling the training "vocational education"; and, as a side benefit, the institution can gain mileage in public relations by being able to identify another "good program" designed to be of help to the inmate.

Another problem of economics is historical. Immediately after World War II, many institutions acquired surplus government property for virtually nothing and used it in development of vocational education programs which at that time were reasonably realistic. Today, however, that equipment is both outdated and simply worn out. The skills which can be learned through its use are no longer in demand; even where the skills are still needed, long delays in training occur through costly breakdowns which require search for scarce or irreplaceable parts. Yet consideration of replacement, in addition to the cost, would raise the question of whether the existent program should be scrapped, and the personnel involved terminated, in favor of more modern occupational concerns. Either way, the change would be prohibitively expensive.

The needs of any vocational education program, and of the system of which it is a part, include good plant, modern machinery and equipment,

modern methodology and technology, good instruction and hands-on experiences in training. All of these must be arranged in terms of solidly-founded knowledge of the present and the future of the concerned industry in general society. The program we design and equip today must, for the next several years, produce trainees who will be familiar with the needs and demands of the industry at that time. As planners, we often--even usually--find it next to impossible to obtain the projections requisite to such decisions.

We are being told today that nearly half of all the jobs currently held by Americans did not exist at the beginning of this century. The worlds of work and technology are changing so rapidly and dramatically that individuals now entering the working world may expect to hold up to five separate, clearly identifiable occupations during their working lives. Planning for such contingencies, when many of the jobs have not yet been invented, is at best a hazardous task. Yet, we must somehow impart to each of our students an understanding of the long-range possibilities and help each to develop the background for both a primary trade and a selection of alternative courses should the first one prove to be unavailable.

Often, even the experts disagree on what's coming next. One of the institutions in my own state recently instituted a vocational education program in commercial baking. Employers now tell us there will not be jobs available for the graduates of the program; the Bakers' Apprenticeship Council assures there are many jobs available now, and there will be more in the future than there are today. We must provide training which is realistic; if we don't, we may destroy our student by preparing him for something which is non-existent. Yet, we aren't sure whom to give our attention. The best we can do is listen carefully to all concerned, and make our

judgments. If our decisions are correct, we will succeed in meeting the "three R's" of vocational education: realistic design, rational development, and response adequate to both student and industry needs.

A few minutes ago, I indicated that vocational programs should be geared to student goals, and I criticized programs geared primarily as feeder units for prison industries. I should clarify my views in this regard. Each training program should contain utility for the student in terms of his own life goals. I see programs which lead nowhere outside the institution as essentially destructive to the individual, unless there is some clear way in which his activity places him in better position for later advances. Ideally, the industries within the institution would be closely related to and identified with similar industry in the wider community. When this is the case, vocational education becomes a continuous flow, beginning with training, processing through in-depth, industry-standard practice in institutional industries, and feeding directly into wider community life.

Similarly, it is essential that ties be maintained between vocational education and all other services provided to the individual student. The illiterate cannot follow a technical manual; academic education must be involved. The farsighted person will have trouble with close work until he has proper glasses; the medical service should be in close conference on individual and group health matters. Proper training cannot go forward with inadequate or unsafe equipment; the safety and sanitation staff should be participants. Plant maintenance needs can often provide variety and stimulation on vocational programs, and should be consulted where possible. Security requirements are often seen as blocks to equipment availability or

program operation, but is surprising how frequently such blocks can be resolved when training and security personnel share the desire to provide good training within a safe and appropriate setting. Close relations with counseling services, and with hobby and crafts programs can have obvious pay-offs for vocational activities. There is no sector of the institution which can be overlooked if a total thrust toward integrated service is to be maintained.

The wider community, from whence the offender came and to which he will return, is the goal of the individual. The reality of programs within the institution must be measured in terms of the wider community. Service within the institution should be simply the beginning of a sequence, not an end in and of itself. No program of service to the individual is complete until he has become fully and acceptably a part of the wider community. Yet, many of us tend to think in parochial terms. How many times have you heard someone say, "He isn't ready to go. He hasn't finished his program"--as though this were possible? In-house education is only one phase of the total program. It should be open-entry/open-exit to assure full utilization of services, and should be established to provide smooth and gradual transition into subsequent phases as opportunities present themselves.

From the outset, each in-house program should be closely allied with the appropriate industry, labor and training groups in the wider community. It is from these organizations that the greatest help can come, and it is these groups which can erect the most formidable barriers when they are not included and involved.

In some areas, development of vocational education programs within institutions has been seriously hampered by objections from labor. Yet, in

those areas where labor has been asked for assistance and cooperation, advice has been soundly and freely given and the resources of the unions have often been made available to the institutional programs. In my own state, for instance, we have found the various apprenticeship councils to be solid supporters of the programs which they helped to design, and to be most helpful in arranging placements for students leaving the institutions. Currently, we have open arrangements for apprenticeships in 12 separate trades within the walls of our Penitentiary, and we are involved in discussions which should lead to similar agreements in four more.

Wider community business and industry are the future employers of our graduates. Their participation in our programs, from inception, is no less important than the participation of labor. To assure the validity of our training sequences, we must have their feedback on the acceptability of our graduates; to assure our graduates reasonable consideration for hiring, the business community needs to have understanding of our programs and methods. We should encourage business representatives to visit our shops and review our course outlines; we should request the cooperation of industry in allowing field trips of our trainees to their facilities. There is growing interest in the business community in such interchanges. During the past several months, for instance, the National Alliance of Businessmen has mounted a major campaign to become involved in training and placement of the ex-offender. Those involved in this program have some liaison personnel between the closed and the open community, with excellent results on both sides. Training programs have come more closely attuned to community needs, and employers have become less fearful of hiring former offenders.

We must never forget the potential advantages of close ties with public

and proprietary education. Educational institutions are in the business of collecting, collating and disseminating the latest information on needs, technology, methods and materials. They are also in the business of awarding dispassionate certification to those who meet established standards of performance, and their certificates carry a general community approval we find hard to attain with correctional facility certification. Training credentialed by an "outside" agency may also receive greater attention and participation from inmates, particularly when it is understood that participation is not contingent upon continued status as an inmate.

Cooperative programs with local junior colleges can be of especial benefit. Most junior colleges are relatively new; the majority of them have come into being within the past ten to 12 years. They are staffed by persons recently trained in modern technology and techniques. Their facilities and equipment are relatively new. Since their organizational ties are usually with the local school district, they tend to be more oriented toward the practical, rather than the theoretical. As local service units, drawing students from and providing graduates to their own communities, they tend to have close ties with current business and industry practices and needs.

Efficiency and economy requirements of corrections demand that we accept a basic rule of thumb in considering programs of any kind; all programs available to the general citizenry should be considered as being at least potentially available to each inmate. When an inmate's need is identified, he should be brought to the existent program which addresses that need. If this cannot be done, the existent program should be brought to the inmate. We should create our own programs within institutions only when

we have identified needs not addressed by existent community programs, or when existent community programs cannot or will not be brought to the inmate. And in such situations, we must initiate our programs in close consultation with their community counterparts in order to assure smooth transition from one to the other at appropriate times.

One of the most serious problems faced by institutional vocational programs is that of proper staff training. Traditionally our instructors have been drawn from the ranks of the master craftsmen. They are highly competent people, but they have had little or no training in instructional methods and materials. Only within the past few years have we begun to obtain a scattering of instructors with AA, BS or state certification qualification.

Attempts to arrange achievement of state certification of existent staff frequently are frustrated by the fact that the requisite courses are not available locally, or are available only during the daytime. Usually, there are insufficient numbers of instructors in need of such training to justify the development of courses in locations other than on major campuses and in major population centers. The result is that institutional staff are cut off from needed training by both time and distance. Many agencies are are now recognizing this problem and are moving to meet it in a variety of imaginative ways. Some are offering subsidies for tuition and/or transportation. Some are arranging extended educational leaves with pay. A few are shifting from the traditional civil service 11½-month work year to the academic 9-month work year, and requiring demonstration of additional coursework during the 3-month break; these few are assuring continuity of program by bringing in junior college instructors on temporary-hire contracts

to fill the gap.

A few agencies are now thinking of carrying this logic to its obvious conclusion: deliberate tying of institutional and junior college staff within a single frame with regular rotation of placements and occasional return to industry employment as an expected feature. In such thinking, there are triple benefits: industry becomes familiar with practices and problems in colleges and institutions; colleges remain aware of institutional issues and industry needs and requirements; institutional staff constantly update their skills and understandings, and maintain close relations with community requirements. All programs become more realistic, and the individual trainee is the recipient.

There are, of course, many problems which I cannot address within the time available to me. I am sure, however, that those who have preceded me on this program and those who will follow are covering many of them. We need to give careful attention to the specific and specialized needs of females and of ethnic minorities; we must be certain that we do not countenance stereotyping in the work ethos. We must learn to design our vocational programs in ways which will permit modification, enlargement and reduction, and even creation and deletion in response to known community trends. To accomplish this, we must identify and consistently use sources of needs and trends information. In Oregon, for instance, we have close ties with the State Employment research and line delivery components. We have the full-time services of four Employment Division counselors, and receive copies of all daily openings listings, monthly and quarterly reports, and of all trend predictions. We also have installed in our institutions terminals of a computer-based regional Career Information System, available to inmates and

staff alike, updated daily for both general and specific information concerning the world of work and the details of jobs. This service, incidentally, is one of the most attractive items of our vocational education counseling and delivery service; inmates who have never before shown interest in vocational programs are standing in line to "chat" with the computer about their interests, needs and desires, and are following up by moving toward the programs indicated through those exchanges.

We must find ways to assure that vocational education is not--by action or by implication--a step-child of the institution's general program thrust. We must assure that the reward system does not discriminate by offering greater pay or greater "good time" potential for farming or for industry than it does for participation in self-improvement. In the long run, such discrimination defeats the basic three R's of corrections, and enhances public costs, both in money and in quality of life.

We must actively seek and foster ties with all human services agencies in the wider community, both public and private, and aggressively draw them into our effort. In this regard, we must at all times keep in mind the fact that legislatures are significant participants--they control our resources and they control our potential for mutual agreements with peer and allied agencies. We must make sure that they are properly aware of our efforts, and clearly informed of both our advantages and our limitations.

We must develop and use channels of communication which include the leadership of the hierarchy. Almost every state has an education coordinating council, designed to assure that all citizens receive those services required. We must work for council acceptance of the concept that correctional clients are citizens and should be given equal attention. We must have the input of

line personnel wherever possible, but we should avoid dissipation of our energy through chipping away on individual teachers and line administrators. We should go through chancellors, coordinating councils and upper-echelon liaison wherever possible.

Recently, the membership of the American Correctional Association joined with the Superintendents and Wardens Association and the Association of State Correctional Administrators in accepting the most detailed and comprehensive set of standards for correctional services which have ever been set forth. Several of these standards specifically addressed the issues of education, both academic and vocational. Currently, the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections is developing detailed measures against which agencies will be considered. We must assure that the highest professional insights of vocational education are included in these standards and that work toward their full implementation is carried forward as a joint venture of all concerned.

As I began, I expressed concern about measures and technology. It seems to me that the realism of our programs, in sum, must be measured in terms of wider community needs and demands, and of the life-fulfillment goals of the individual. Improvement must be assessed in light of program progress toward clearly stated long-range objectives. The "three R's" of vocational education in corrections must be realistic design, rational development, and response adequate to needs. We are all aware that there are a few truly excellent vocational education programs in American corrections, and that there are many good ones. We are also aware, however, that the majority of our delivery systems simply do not meet the requirements of the vocational educator's "three R's."

In summary, I suggest that the "three R's" may best be served through adoption of a set of "ABC's":

1. Aggressive action to attain agreements among all concerned as to aims and methods of their achievements;
2. Balanced, broad-span batteries of basic program options serving the best long-range interests of all;
3. Carrying forward with comprehensive, coordinated delivery systems incorporating corrections and the community in cooperatively addressing client and community needs.

I am sure that the results of this conference will move us closer to these goals.

"How Do We Develop Realistic Programs?"

Francis Tuttle, State Director
State Department of Vocational & Technical Education
Stillwater, Oklahoma

There are hundreds of vocational training programs in prisons in all 50 states; however, skilled vocational training has not been offered in these institutions for very many years and few realistic programs exist today. Inmates who are serving terms usually are not interested in extensive training, especially if it lengthens their time of incarceration. Our main objective generally is to provide training for inmates who are sentenced to one year or more in order that they may complete a training program and be able to obtain employment when released. Some institutions across the nation offer accredited apprenticeship programs; college credit courses where inmates work toward A.A., B.A., and M.A. degrees; adult studies in which inmates complete their high school education or take adult basic education classes or other noncredit courses; and vocational training in auto mechanics, brick and block masonry, welding, auto body, electronics, air conditioning and refrigeration, drafting and design and other trade related courses, distributive education, licensed vocational nurses training, agriculture, business and office, gainful home economics and many other programs.

We commonly develop realistic programs of vocational education in correctional institutions by offering only training that may result in employment. Surveys show what programs are desired by inmates and at what level the programs should be offered. Most states now know what training programs offer the greatest employment opportunities. Prospective students in correctional institutions are usually given a series of placement tests. The

results provide the staff with measurements of ability and knowledge in specific subject areas. The information is used as the basis for determining the kinds of programs to be offered. Usually this procedure is not too satisfactory. These programs need to be improved and staffed with knowledgeable personnel. When implementing a program, it is important that the counselor, supervisor, or other personnel have extensive contacts with the business community to facilitate cooperation in placement and training of trained inmates. Since the majority of inmates are not sentenced for violent or repetitive offenses, most are accepted for vocational training.

In most states funding for inmate training is provided through the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the State Department of Labor, the Comprehensive Employment Training Act funds, plus state appropriated funds.

Reintroduction to the outside world is as important as the training itself. Counselors and supervisors should assess the vocational skills and interests of assigned inmates, develop and maintain employment and training resources, help inmates develop work/training plans, suggest strategies to properly approach employer interviews, and continue to assess the progress of the individual during the job development and final placement. Ideally, inmates should be introduced to the outside world through pre-release programs. Of course, the philosophy of the institution will determine the extent to which this is possible.

It is also important that inmates be given a greater responsibility for their vocational development. If they are made partners in the development of their work/training plan, they will accept a great deal of responsibility for their own future. Most inmates will need help in the development of a plan, for without one, they will be forced to consider alternatives that are not appropriate.

There are many practical ways of providing training programs. For example, almost every correctional institution has a landscape program. Unfortunately, the major objective of many of these programs is to maintain attractive grounds around the institution; however, this is a potentially useful training program that will give job opportunities and mobility to trainees in landscape design and in planting and care of ornamental shrubs and grasses. The demand for such skills increase with the growth of metropolitan areas, with the increasing demand for outdoor recreation and park facilities, and with the rise in home ownership. A number of jobs in this area are with government and public agencies, which are prohibited by law from discriminating against ex-convicts in hiring. Prospects for graduates of the program with those skills are good.

Distributive education is a nationally recognized vocational education program which combines work and study in merchandising, marketing, management, and service operations. This program was one of the first Oklahoma attempts to prove that incarcerated youth could be successfully rehabilitated through work release. Careful screening of candidates for training and of employers is essential for success. Only students who are old enough for working permits are eligible for the work release portion of the program. Age may also determine the type of job which the student can obtain. There is usually a higher success rate among the younger students.

Nursing is an exacting profession. Some institutions provide classroom instruction and training for this course in nurse's aid classes at the prison hospitals. These classes prepare students for the Vocational Nurse Examiners Test and hospitals provide graduates with letters of recommendation. Job opportunities for licensed vocational nurses are good.

Regulations governing cosmetology training are generally set up by a

state board. Any institution contemplating such a program should contact that board for information on the regulations. Arrangements for students to take examinations at the institution might be arranged through the board if the institution will not permit students to be released for the regular examination. The class supervisor must be licensed by the state. Usually students in cosmetology must have at least a tenth grade education or equivalent. The supervisor can be instrumental in getting many of the graduates jobs by having extensive contacts in the cosmetology field.

In-service education for staff members is an important component of any vocational education program. Without the proper assessment of staff development needs and the preparation of instructors, vocational programs will not fulfill their purposes. In-service training programs are especially important wherever the integration of the academic and the vocational disciplines are essential. If it is important that academic and vocational teachers work together, then a staff development program will be mandatory..

Traditionally, educational services for prisoners have been a low priority. Programs have been funded by a variety of agencies, federal and state, and have lacked continuity, coordination and consistency. Establishing a single administrative agency for the delivery of education services within the department of corrections may be the answer. However, it would require special legislative action in most states.

We can develop realistic vocational education programs in correctional institutions by:

1. Providing opportunities which would help the student master the basic skills of reading, communication, and problem solving.

2. Provide an environment which would help students develop a positive attitude toward learning.
3. Foster a feeling of adequacy and self-worth on the part of each student.
4. Provide opportunities for students to express the full extent of their creativities.
5. Provide experiences which help students to adapt to a world of change.
6. Help students acquire and demonstrate an appreciation for and positive attitude toward persons and cultures different from their own.
7. Help every student receive opportunity in training for the world of work.
8. Provide experiences which will enable students to cope with the barriers and fears expressed by society towards them.
9. Provide on-the-job follow-up to make sure the enrollee is progressing satisfactorily; that no related problems are hindering his progress; and that the employer is satisfied with his performance.

The most innovative program in prison training to date was implemented at Elmira Reformatory, N.Y., in 1867 to 1887. The program was so acclaimed because it marked the beginning of the Reformatory Movement in America. It must have been thought to have achieved the desired results for it has been copied throughout the world, yet I know of no state that has developed an outstanding program of corrections education. We just do not do as much as we know to do.

My experience in dealing with education programs in the correctional systems in Oklahoma leads me to think that correctional officials are too engrossed with the day-to-day activities within the penal system and never get to the rehabilitative planning that should occur. Their priorities seem to be on security to such an extent that rehabilitation is almost omitted, or if included, it is done only in a halfhearted manner.

Someone made the statement that education was too important to leave it to educators. "Educational rehabilitation programs are too important to leave them to the correctional officials!"

I believe that if realistic inmate training programs are to be developed, they must be of two types:

1. Training for long-term inmates on entry into the correctional system which will provide the necessary skills to maintain the system. Every inmate should be required to work enough to pay for his upkeep.
2. Exit training should be provided for all who can profit from it. This may mean updating existing skills or may mean training in a new skill or trade so the inmate can be employed.
   -- The training should be coordinated with expected release dates with time to be placed in pre-release centers and employment on a job in which the inmate received training.

I personally believe that a plan for rehabilitation of each inmate should be developed and followed or altered according to the inmate's behavior and reaction to his education and treatment.

The parole program should be based on education, training, work and personal behavior of each inmate.

Education and training should receive a high priority toward the parole. Follow-up should be provided on each inmate within limits that are realistic. Parole officers should be required to report on employment success or failure to evaluate the program of training and education.

"Reaction to Presentations of
Amos Reed and Francis Tuttle"

Anthony P. Travisono, Executive Director
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Corrections is a tough business. There was some glimmer of hope developing in the late sixties and early seventies that major improvements might have been made in corrections through the intervention of courts. But major changes have not taken place.

Today we are probably in the same position we were 10 or 15 years ago when overcrowding was a serious problem. In fact, overcrowding is the most frequent and serious problem we have been experiencing. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be light at the end of that tunnel. Those who have not been close to corrections soon learn that contrary to the educational field, where we have big systems that grow and grow, we in corrections are trying to reduce populations. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be a major commitment to decrease the size of correctional institutions and to follow the trends of community-based programming that many of us thought was gaining momentum. Our probation and parole case loads are very high throughout the United States. The system has reached a saturation point, and as a result, we are presently experiencing grave problems in accepting and pursuing some of the elements that we should have in our systems.

Mr. Reed has spelled out to you some of the ideal things that we would like to have and I hope he does have in Oregon. Mr. Tuttle indicated the same kinds of things from his point of view. The major problems we are experiencing today will continue to preoccupy the field over the next 10 or 15 years, unless we have enthusiastic response from educators such as yourselves who are

interested in joining with us to provide assistance in narrowing that threshold.

Corrections has experienced a token acceptance of vocational education in many of our states--yes, only a token acceptance. We all know that we have had some vocational educators in most institutions for a long time. Although some of it is really O.J.T., the institutions which have had vocational education are relatively insignificant, when you consider that many large correctional institutions have populations of 1,000 to 2,000 inmates and may have few vocational education programs. Experience has repeatedly demonstrated that these token efforts have failed to meet the need. When directors of correctional agencies go to their respective legislators to request funds, they seldom find a sympathetic ear, particularly if a program already exists and they can see no need to expand it. It has been a very difficult struggle for directors to go beyond what I call a token acceptance of vocational education in our institutions because of the high cost of vocational education programs.

Another fundamental question that has again come to the forefront, is the philosophical issue of punishment versus treatment. The debate has just begun again. I would ask this group, do any of us here have any knowledge of what punishment is all about? Do you recommend punishment? Do you not recommend punishment? If so, how much, to whom, and how? Although the debate has been going on for centuries, it is becoming heated and will continue to go on for sometime. In addition, the "nothing works" and "rehabilitation hoax" schools of thought currently are overwhelming most practitioners and causing many to choose either the punishment or rehabilitation approach--as if they were the only games in town. I would suggest that some of each approach is what is necessary.

Another sector that influences education in corrections is the federal sector, especially HEW and LEAA. This particular conference was funded by the Bureau of Adult and Occupational Education of the Office of Education. But LEAA is also vitally interested in education. They have awarded a major grant to the Educational Commission of the States to undertake a three-year study of education in correctional institutions. LEAA has also awarded a grant to the American Correctional Association to do a short state-of-the-art survey of educational technology in correctional institutions. LEAA definitely wants to know the present status of educational opportunities for offenders.

I suspect that education is one of the weakest links in the correctional continuum. But we must be aware that vocational education is not limited to institutions only. For some strange reason we are seldom concerned about the persons on parole or probation. We tend to concentrate all of our attention on people inside institutions. We must plan for the entire continuum.

This conference is unique and we are all hopeful of the renewed concern for vocational education. It is a positive event.

"Reaction to Presentations by
Amos Reed and Francis Tuttle"

Ralph Bregman, Assistant Professor
University of California
Los Angeles, California

With all of what's been said, it's hard to add many new ideas. I think that Amos and Fran have given us a beautiful blueprint to answer the question of how we can develop realistic programs. If you go down their lists of the ideas that were enumerated, such as the ombudsman assisting the parolee in pursuing his occupational goals, you will find the substance of program development. The Career Education Model that Amos mentioned, and the total or comprehensive program approach that we've discussed in our little groups, provide the essence for developing realistic programs. Fran talked about teachers and flexible staffing and about flexible certification. These ideas in concert with the other suggestions have answered the topic that was posed for us. Therefore, let me just summarize four thoughts that transcend the presentations.

Vocational Education - An Alternative to Training

I believe that too much emphasis has been placed on the concept of job acquisition through vocational training. The reason we're talking about vocational education in this conference is because job training has not worked. There is no evidence--respectable evidence--that has shown that job training (vocational training) has worked in terms of rehabilitation. Having said that, I think we're here to say that maybe vocational education has a role to play.

Socialization and Maturity

I submit to you that a facet of vocational education, which is socialization, should be carefully explored. The socialization process of inducting an immature person into the adult world--the free world--has much to say to us. The idea of using vocational education as a tool to transit from immaturity to maturity is at hand.

Prisoners' Rights

The time is ripe for changing the system. That we're meeting here at this first conference is significant. In addition, there is a movement for prisoners' rights. They are demanding their rights for quality programming. The women in a Massachusetts prison are taking a state agency to court because they want to have the same quality programming as that given to their male counterparts.

Social Movement

The fourth thought is that we're on the brink of a social movement. For example, the GAO's Report, "Department of Labor's Past and Future Role in Offender Rehabilitation," has emphasized the need to fund effective programs. The Equal Opportunity Movement and public consternation over crime stimulate this movement. We have a rare opportunity, I think, if we are willing to take it and run with it.

In summary, the people have been saying to us that there has to be a commitment for vertical-integration (cooperation) and horizontal-integration with all elements or components of the system. Because corrections operates within a semi-closed system--the environment does not control, but minimally affects internal components--there is a unique opportunity to develop a model

for coordination and cooperation.

Much of what we said today and yesterday reflects the ills in our public education system. We talked about lack of guidance and poor placement; the same problems that afflict the education system. If we can pull the appropriate components of the corrections enterprise together by using the talent and the expertise that is here at this conference, I think we can develop a model for the outside community to observe and then possibly to emulate.

"Developing Cooperation Between State Agencies"

Byrl R. Shoemaker, State Director
Division of Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

This issue of vocational education in correctional institutions is becoming more popular. Nevertheless, there aren't enough programs, they aren't good enough, and there isn't enough cooperation between the involved agencies. The major issues and deficiencies are reported in a recent study by the Education Commission of the States. Everyone is getting into the act, but we don't have any real champion. A lot of people are talking but no people in real authority are making significant moves. There is still a great competition for dollars. As a person who has to try to make decisions on those dollars, you have many thrusts upon you and only areas of proven results will really get a continuing investment.

Several years ago, we were willing to invest $90,700 of our vocational education funds with Pat Cronin and a study group. Pat wasn't in his present job; but he's a good salesman, and he convinced us that there was a problem and a need. He pulled together a committee and did a significant study on vocational education needs in correctional institutions in Ohio. In this process, he traveled all over the country taking a look at vocational education within correctional institutions. A very sad situation was reported as he looked at some places and some conditions that were supposed to be exemplary. While the existing effort might be exemplary in quality, none were exemplary in terms of quantity of effort necessary to make a change.

The results of the Cronin study are still in the process of having an effect upon the effort we make in Ohio. I've learned a long time ago that

you don't put anything into operation overnight. We're disappointed that more of the effort hasn't gone into implementation. But the reason is not a disagreement with the concepts, the reasons are the ability to gain the necessary funds.

Let's look at what we are doing in Ohio. In our adult correctional facilities we have a high school operation called Ohio Central School System, offering adult basic education, general education development tests, high school programs and vocational education. In addition, there are apprenticeship offerings with one apprenticeship committee serving all institutions. There are over 150 vocational education staff personnel in the adult correctional institutions. Ten of them are funded by CETA or by LEAA, one by Vo-Ed, and 20 by the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections. Quite obviously the major funding is from the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections--an indication of a concern and interest from them.

The Division of Vocational Education believes we have a blueprint that we haven't even begun to implement. The immediate needs are for a greater counseling input, an improved placement and follow-up service, and committed educational funding, which neither the Department of Corrections nor our division have. Neither of us has a line item dealing with vocational education in correctional institutions. Until we get identified funding in either our Division or corrections, I don't think there will be a continuing, lasting, expanding commitment.

We have over 10,000 people in our adult prison population, with an annual release of around 4,000 to 5,000. Our average period of stay is only about 18 months. With a 10,000 population and an average annual release of 4,000, a vocational enrollment of 600 daily is maintained. With an average of two

groups a year, about 1,200 are served annually in terms of training within our correctional institutions. Even simple mathematics will show you that we are not serving the numbers of releasees that we have from our correctional institutions. We think we have something going, but we are reaching for more.

The Youth Commission has 2,187 young people incarcerated in our youth institutions. Most of them have such a short term that we have a hard time giving them any education, including vocational education. We have over 500 enrolled in vocational education daily in 27 vocational offerings in four institutions. Vocational Rehabilitation Service provides funds for about six of the programs within those institutions.

Our Division of Vocational Education has developed a pattern of cooperation with the Department of Corrections and the Youth Commission from the time invested in the study with Mr. Cronin. Before the study, such cooperation was very haphazard. I believe there is no longer a problem of communication, no problem of understanding each other, no problem of willingness to cooperate among these three agencies--the Division of Vocational Education, the Department of Corrections, and the Youth Commission--at the present time.

I can say that, but what evidences are there of it? Well, I believe that when you invest money you give some evidence of cooperation and so given the factor that we have a responsibility, and they have a responsibility, the three agencies have cooperatively employed a full-time teacher educator out of Ohio State University to work with the teachers both in the corrections organizations and in the Youth Commission. We share the salary of this teacher educator, who is on the staff at Ohio State, and whose total responsibility is teacher education for the teachers within the Department of Corrections and the Youth Commission.

A second person is employed cooperatively as a supervisor for vocational education within correctional institutions. Again, the three agencies share the salary of this person. Mr. Neil Johnson has been in attendance at this meeting for the full time. This person works with all of the institutions on a continuing basis, relating those institutions with our efforts in vocational education. The educational personnel in both corrections and youth are welcome and a part of our total state-wide vocational education meetings.

We found some things that help which go beyond money. The teacher classifications in corrections and in youth commission are tied to teacher certification; and teacher certification is tied to teacher education. We have, therefore, a pattern of providing teacher education tied to certification standards in our state department of education. As the teachers in corrections improve their certification level, they improve their salary classification. We believe we have made a breakthrough in terms of relating efforts for quality instruction within our corrections and youth institutions, with a continuing pattern of teacher education--the same as we provide for our teachers in our public schools.

We have also worked on the approval of educational programs in correctional institutions. We found that when programs were submitted to our State Division of Vocational Education and approved by our Division on the basis of standards, educational standards within those institutions could be maintained.

My first experience in reviewing programs in corrections was in 1960. We visited the Youth Commission Center in Ohio and took a look. They invited us in and we told them essentially, "You have no vocational education. You have a group of maintenance efforts which are poorly coordinated and have no real

relationship with education." That was a fact. We found that as those programs had to be submitted to our Division of Vocational Education, we were able to say, "These are standards for education and for vocational education within the correctional institutions."

We are not making a massive investment of dollars from the Division of Vocational Education in adult corrections or Youth Commission vocational education efforts. I believe the Youth Commission, the Department of Corrections, and the Division of Vocational Education are continuing to work together to identify funds, but those funds need to come primarily from within the Department of Corrections. To date, our state has not said that it is really interested enough in the vocational training of inmates to make a significant identified investment. I believe that until there are more facts some additional studies are needed which point up the value of such educational services to society in terms of not only the work of the individual but also a decrease in the recidivism within the people attending our institutions.

I'm pleased that this first meeting has been held in Ohio. I think we have a blueprint for excellence that was left with us, but I think we need to find better ways to implement that blueprint if we're to say that we are doing enough in Ohio to make a difference.

"How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches
to Vocational Education in Corrections?"

Sylvia G. McCollum, Education Administrator
U. S. Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D. C.

Cooperation Needed at Different Levels

I don't think there is anything unique about developing cooperation in vocational education in corrections. The elements of sound cooperative approaches cut across all disciplines and institutions.

First Level - The Educational Community

However, before addressing this issue I would like to identify the levels at which I think cooperation has to take place. First, we need to examine the educational community. In my view, unless some changes take place in the educational community itself, it will not be in the strongest possible position to deliver educational services to correctional institutions. Let me give some examples to illustrate the impediments to cooperative efforts in the educational community.

I've participated in meetings with representatives of educational institutions in several states in attempts to develop consortiums to provide for the interchange of course credits and for the orderly transfer of enrollments so that prisoners moving from one institution to another institution in the same state can continue their studies and carry their earned course credits with them. We have also tried to work out flexible scheduling, open-ended programming and individualized instruction so that the educational community can accommodate, in a practical and immediate way, the needs for vocational education as they exist in correctional settings. In some cases we

have been successful; in others, unsuccessful.

A second example involves a prison and a vocational school funded by the Manpower Administration to provide skill training to prisoners. For several years prisoner/students attended classes in a nearby area vocational school on a study-release basis. They attended regular classes with other students, taking such courses as drafting, accounting and automotive maintenance-repair. They enjoyed two years of successful experience and not a single negative incident was reported. There was tremendous acceptance of the prisoner/students by the instructors and the regular students.

Despite the good experiences, we were informed that the local board of education had voted to discontinue mixing prisoner/students with "free world" students; that if we wanted to continue our relationship, it would have to be on an evening basis and the prisoner/students would be isolated in classes of their own, or the school could send instructors to the prison to teach classes there.

A third kind of impediment to effective delivery of services in the educational community relates to the unwillingness of some institutions to accept, mind you, not even accept, an application for admission from an ex-offender. We may get prisoner/students to a point of readiness to move on to further education based on achievements completed while in prison, but unless offenders can apply to colleges, technical schools or other postsecondary institutions after release, the credibility of prison education programs is suspect.

Second Level - The Correctional Community

Let's examine the correctional community, a second area within which cooperation has to increase if effective vocational education is to take

place. Education in prisons is frequently given low priority. Prisons seldom transfer prisoner/students for education purposes. It is also difficult to transfer records quickly if a prisoner/student is transferred to another institution for security or other reasons. Continuity of educational involvement of transferred students is difficult.

I think all of us recognize that neither the educational nor the correctional community can change overnight to correct all the situations I've described. However, if we think of all the problems on a continuum, certainly there is a great deal of room to move from where we are now to where we hope to be. I bring these matters to our attention not to suggest that changes should or could occur tomorrow; but rather we need to identify our problem areas and we need to begin work on them, each in our separate ways, working to a common goal: better vocational education in prison.

Cooperation between the correction and education communities can be greatly facilitated if each looks inward to evaluate how it can prepare itself for maximum cooperative efforts. Traditional attitudes need to be reexamined in light of practical realities and, most important, in terms of the needs of the client population.

Third Level - Other Agencies and the Community

A third level of cooperation critical to effective development of cooperative approaches to vocational education in corrections relates to funding resources, public and private agencies whose programs affect education programs and the community-at-large. I am thinking here of such financial assistance resources as the Office of Education and its Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOG) program, work-study programs, federally in-

sured student loans and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and its special student assistance programs as well as other public and private organizations which offer educational support to students. Government agencies at the federal and state level which still have inappropriate licensing requirements or other obstacles to ex-offender employment need to consider changes in their regulations to facilitate the employment of trained and qualified ex-offenders. The United States Employment Service and other job development and placement services need to be strengthened to assist ex-offenders in their search for work. Effective vocational education in corrections must be in terms of realistic and immediate social, economic and related coping skills if it is to meet the needs of the prisoner/student population.

Finally to the point of <u>how</u> we develop cooperative approaches to vocational education in corrections among all those who have a contribution to make:

1. Each of us should avoid adversary or threatening postures and try to think in positive, facilitating terms. The delivery of much needed services must be our primary concern.
2. We need to understand and respect each other's special problems. For example, educators must appreciate that in corrections security is of primary importance. Additionally, because of the realities of the institutional situations, programs need to be open-ended and flexible. Technology, individualized instruction and various other approaches which take into account the characteristics of prisoner/

student populations and institutional constraints need to be utilized.

3. On the other hand, staff in corrections must understand that for effective education to take place appropriate space and equipment must be dedicated. Students have to be in the classroom or in the learning centers when expected and scheduled. Call-outs for special reasons have to be handled appropriately. Prime time for classes, library and study facilities and positive rewards for accomplishments need to be built into effective programming.
4. Finally, post-release linkages have to be a critical factor in any cooperative approach to vocational education in corrections.

Conclusion

My outlook is extremely optimistic. The need for effective vocational education in corrections is there. The vocational education community has the competence to deliver the services and correctional administrations, related agencies and the public are eager to have them.

"How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches to Vocational Education in Corrections?"

John Armore, Director, Ex-Offender Program
National Alliance of Businessmen
Washington, D.C.

President Johnson created the National Alliance of Businessmen in 1968 to promote jobs in the private sector for the hard-core unemployed. He asked Henry Ford to head the Alliance; and Ford responded. Representatives of the business community were gathered together to utilize its resources in resolving the problem of hard-core unemployment. Each year a different national corporation heads the Alliance; and its charge is not only to promote jobs in the private sector for the hard-core unemployed (now referred to as disadvantaged) but to promote jobs for Vietnam-era veterans and needy youth. Our last mandate was to promote job opportunities in the private sector for ex-offenders. The mandate was reiterated by President Ford three and a half months ago.

We now have an ongoing ex-offender program in 137 offices across the country manned and staffed primarily by businessmen on loan to the Alliance for periods of time ranging up to two years. We attempt to educate the businessman to what the mystique of corrections is all about. That is the charge and the responsibility that was given to me.

The subject is: how do we develop cooperative approaches to vocational education in corrections? First let's understand what NAB tells the business community. Let us first understand the basic concept of prisons and who the people are within the prisons, what's happening within the prisons, and the cost of prisons--the dollar costs. We sell the ex-offender to the business community not on the basis of humanitarianism or social responsibility, but on what it's costing the business community in dollars and cents. We talk to the

business community today about the cost of building a new prison cell.

I was in Louisville a few weeks ago. They're building a new prison down there that is costing tax payers $50,000 a cell. If you amortize that over a period of 20 to 30 years it's costing $150,000 per cell to tax payers. That doesn't include the costs of upkeep, maintenance and custodial staff. It doesn't include vocational training within the institutions.

About 10 to 15 percent of the total inmate population in this country purports to receive vocational education. Now that is not a large number of people when we talk about the 200,000 human beings that are confined in what I refer to as society's garbage pail--about 20,000 to 25,000 people. And yet we can't face the fact that we've got a problem. We continue to study to determine whether or not we do have a problem and whether or not we can address this problem with the resources that we have today.

The correction's budget in your various jurisdictions do have the necessary funds to provide meaningful vocational training within the institutions. But what do we hear: "we've got to find additional sources of funding." The only time we do have any vocational training programs within any of the institutions is when we get either CETA dollars, or LEAA dollars, or DOL dollars. If we don't get these dollars then we don't have any programs. The business community is concerned with what's happening to the tax dollars that are going to support these institutions. Business wants to get involved. They are concerned basically because there's so little happening within the confines of the institution.

But how does the businessman climb over the wall? How does he get into the institution? In many states, we find that there's a lot of hassle for the businessman to visit an institution--to take a look at what is going on. When

he wants to get involved, he finds that it's not that easy. I sometimes think that prisons serve a two-fold purpose--to keep people in and the community out. We've got to break down this wall.

We want to cooperate, and we have been cooperating in some jurisdictions. I'd just like to point out a few to you. In New Jersey, NAB and its offices have a total cooperative effort with the Garden State School District that provides not only vocational training and academic training but job development. In Oregon, NAB is involved because corrections realizes that it can't do it alone. In Washington the Commission for Vocational Education has a clearinghouse for offender employment and they're working closely with the National Alliance of Businessmen and the Department of Corrections. The business community has become involved, in response to a challenge from the governor, in a corporate task force on corrections. They are in the process of developing a master plan funded primarily by the state with contributing funds by the private sector to come up with an alternative plan of incarceration.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has loaned the NAB an executive. A director of their Community Treatment Center in Detroit is coming to NAB to build a closer working relationship with the Bureau of Prisons and assist the Bureau in helping to place their releasees.

This is what it's all about. But what do I see--states that are paranoid concerning involvement--they want to go it alone.

Let me tell you about what NAB is doing on a national basis in order to expose the business community to what we refer to as the mystique of corrections. We promote governors' conferences on the employment of the ex-offender. We ask the governor of the state to invite the top business leaders of the state to discuss the problem of ex-offender employment. Working in conjunction

with the Department of Corrections and other areas of social concern, we expose the business community, for perhaps the first time, to what their social responsibility is and what it's costing them.

Secondly, we promote prison visits by employers throughout our 137 offices. We ask our people to get the business community into prisons of our country to see first hand what is going on, and get on the advisory boards of those institutions to help formulate a substantive policy in the area of vocational education.

We also conduct what we refer to as Career Motivation Institutes. We bring in the business community to work with inmates to establish realistic goals and aspirations.

Let me cite to you an example of what I saw on a visit to a state not represented here. I walked into the institution, went into the vocational training section and found the vocational trainer seated at his desk with his feet up. There wasn't a student within 250 feet of the class. When I started making inquiry of the staff and the inmates, I found out that the program was really a sham, that all the inmate does is his a.m.'s and p.m.'s and then back to his cage. Now I ask you: is that vocational education?

In Florida, I've been told that we now have erected "tent cities" to accommodate our inmate population. I assume part of their vocational training is going to be cutting the grass and pulling the weeds, under the guise of such vocational training.

Is that what it's all about? You have a challenge here today. I am glad to have been part of that challenge and I hope that I have been able to provide something of substance to your endeavor.

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX F

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOCUMENTS RELATED TO
IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RESOURCES
IN CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

December, 1975

Adair, J. B. Study of Illiteracy in Texas as Related to Vocational Education. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1964.

Administration of Justice in a Changing Society--Report on Developments in the United States--1965 to 1970. District of Columbia, Bureau of Prisons, 1970.

American Bar Association. Expanding Government Job Opportunities for Ex-Offenders. Chicago, Illinois: American Bar Association, n.d.

American Correctional Association--Annual Congress of Correction--98th--Proceedings at San Francisco, California. sales/source-College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1968.

American Correctional Association--Annual Congress of Correction--99th--Proceedings at Minneapolis, Minnesota. sales/source-College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1969.

American Correctional Assocation--Annual Congress of Correction--100th--Proceedings from Cincinnati, Ohio. sales/source-College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1970.

Assessment of Junior College Program for Youthful Offenders in an Institution. California Department of Youth Authority, 1973.

Baker, Keith, Haberfield, Steven, Irwin, John, Scashore, Marjorie, and Leonard, Donald. Project Newgate and Other Prison College Education Programs. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1973.

Baker, M., and Mahan, Joann. Second Differential Education Model for I-4 Neurotic Anxious Students. California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973.

Bell, P. B., and Matthews, M. Future for Correctional Rehabilitation -Final Report--Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program. Washington Coordinate Council for Occupational Education, 1969.

Blumstein, A., and Pahl, S. Evaluation of a College Level Education Program in a Prison--Methodology and Data Base--1st Progress Report. Carnegie-Mellon University, 1971.

Boslow, H. M., and Kandel, A. Psychiatric Aspects of Dangerous Behavior--The Retarded Offender. Address delivered at American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting, 1965.

Boyles, Gary. The Educational and Vocational Aspirations of Prisoners, 1967.

Brady, J., and Grellotti, R. Massachusetts--Study of Community-Based Correctional Needs. Massachusetts Department of Corrections, 1972.

Bureau of Prisons Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, 1969.

Burlington Management Services. Development of a Total Correctional Information System--Report on Phase II. Funded by North Carolina Department of Corrections, 1972.

Burns, Jr., Henry. Correctional Staff Training Institutes--Final Report. Carbondale, Illinois: The Center for the Study of Criminal Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University, 1969.

California, State Human Relations Agency. Coordinated California Corrections: Field Services--Probation and Parole. Correctional System Study. New York, New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1971.

California, State Human Relations Agency. Coordinated California Corrections: Institutions. Correctional System Study. Final Report. Sacramento, California: Board of Corrections, 1971.

Callahan, T. J. "Potentialities and Limitations of the Ex-Offender Para-Professional in a Correctional Setting". Probation and Parole, no. 5, Summer, 1973, pp. 64-70.

Campbell, D. D. "Developing Continuing Education in the Correctional Institution--Some Principles and Practices". Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, April, 1974, pp. 117-132.

Carter, R. M., and Glaser, D. Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J. B. Lippincott, 1972.

Cayton, P. W. Counseling Process in a Management Delinquency Training Program for Offenders--Emphasis--Problems. Funded by Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1967.

Cayton, Paul W. Barriers to the Employment of Released Male Offenders. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1970.

Chamber of Commerce in the United States. Marshalling Citizen Power to Modernize Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Funded by Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1972.

Chandler, E. W. Women in Prison. New York City, New York: Bobbs Merrill, Incorporated, 1973.

Characteristics of Inmates Discharged from New York State Department of Correctional Services Institutions in 1972. New York, New York: New York Department of Correctional Services, 1973.

Collins, Jr., Joseph W., and Weisberg, Rich. Training Needs in Correctional Institutions. Manpower Research Bulletin 8, 1966.

Colorado State Reformatory Incentive Program. Colorado: Colorado Division of Corrections, 1972.

Commission on the Status of Women. From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Women Offender. Washington, D.C.: Manpower, 1974.

Commission on Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions. Commission on Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions--Final Report. Trenton, New Jersey: Commission on Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions, 1972.

Community and Criminal Justice--A Guide for Organizing Action. Washington, D.C.: National Conference on Criminal Justice, 1973.

Community Work An Alternative to Imprisonment, (Principles and Guidelines) Correctional Research Associates, 1967.

Cooper, H. H. "Toward a Rational Doctrine of Rehabilitation". Crime and Delinquency, April, 1973, pp. 228-240.

Correctional Education, A Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, n.d.

Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change--Summary--Correctional Briefings no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Corrections. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973.

Cowan, Sr., Samuel S. Modular Instruction in Automobile Body Repair Vocational Training. Petersburg, Virginia: Federal Reformatory, 1970.

Cox, G. F. Project Intercept--Eighteen Months Progress Report, 1971 and 1972. North Bay Human Development Corporation.

Craig, John, and others. Outreach and Occupational Education in Colorado. Palo Alto, California: Academy for Education Development, 1972.

Cronin, F. P., and others. Evaluative Planning Research Project in Vocational Education for Ohio Division of Correctional Institutions. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Department of Mental Hygiene and Corrections, 1972.

Curry, D., and Daly, C. Differential Education Model for I-3 Immature Conformists. California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973.

Dell'Apa, F. Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions--A Survey. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, n.d.

Dell'Apa, F. Utah--Preliminary Surveys--State Prison and the State Industrial School. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1968.

Dickover, R. M., and Maynard, V. E. California Department of Corrections--Study of Vocational Training. California Department of Corrections, 1971

District of Columbia Department of Corrections--Comprehensive Training Program. Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Department of Corrections, 1968.

Doing Your Own Time--A Citizen Study of the Kansas State Penitentiary, Report Volume 2, Kansas Association for Mental Health, 1973.

Downes, D. M. Delinquent Solution, A Study in Subculture Theory. New York City, New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Draper E and D Project, The. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation-Draper Correctional Center, 1968.

Eckenrode, C. J., and Cummings, L. E. "Experience Unit Method of Teaching Confined Youth". Correctional Education, Spring, 1973, pp. 39-44.

Education and Training in Correctional Institutions--Proceedings of a Conference, Eric Documents Reproduction Services, 1968.

Effect of Vocational Upgrading Upon Probationer Recidivism, One-Year Evaluation of the Singer/Grafle: Monroe County, New York Pilot Probation Project. Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972.

Endwright, D. K. A Plan for Expansion and Development of Education Departments of Florida Division of Corrections, in Cooperation with the Florida State University Adult Education Department. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Division of Corrections, 1967.

Evaluation of Manpower Development Training Act in Correctional Institutions, Vz--Profiles on Inmate Training Projects. Abt Associates, 1971.

Excerpt from Training for New Careers--The Community Apprentice Program. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, n. d.

Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections: Phase I--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, 1970.

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated--Board of Directors--Final Report. Federal Prisons Industries, Incorporated, 1970.

Ferdum, G. S., and Lockhard, H. R. Jobs Related to Training--Final Report. California Department of Youth Authority, Educational Research Series, no. 12, 1973.

Ferracuti, Franco and Gianni. Manpower and Training in the Field of Social Defense: A Commentary and Bibliography. Rome, Italy: United Nations Social Defense Research Institute, 1970.

Fisher, R. G. Maryland--Analysis of Comprehensive Plans to Develop a Statewide Community Corrections System. Maryland Government Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1973.

From Campus to Corrections--A Demonstration Project and Manual on Institutes to Attract College Students to Correctional Service. New York, New York: New York State Supreme Court, 1969.

Fulton, W. Scott, editor. A Future for Correctional Rehabilitation? Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program--Final Report, 1969.

Garay, Bert. Pilot Study of Four Selected Groups of Parolees. Olympia, Washington: Washington State Board of Prison Terms and Parolees, 1971.

Gentry, William L. Modular Instruction--Machine Shop Vocational Training. Petersburg, Virginia: Federal Reformatory, 1972.

Gilliam, J. L. Project First Chance Training, Job Placement, Social Services and Half-Way House Facilities. Columbia, South Carolina: South Carolina Department of Corrections, 1969.

Gillie, Angelo C. The Fifth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education. University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for Study of Higher Education, 1974.

Glaser, D. Changes in Corrections During the Next Twenty Years--from Systems and Training Analysis of Requirements for Criminal Justice Participants. Funded by California Department of Justice, 1971.

Glaser, D. Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York City, New York: Bobbs-Merrill, abridged edition, 1969.

Glaser, D. Prison of the Future. St. Leonard's House, 1965.

Glenn, John. Projections for Correctional Programs in Education: Learning a Living. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona State Department of Vocational Education, 1969.

Godby, C. D. Oregon--Work Release Six-Year Report. Oregon Corrections Division, 1966 and 1972.

Goldenberg, I. I. Employment and Addiction--Perspectives on Existing Business and Treatment Practices. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1972.

Guide for Employment Service Counselors in Correctional Manpower Development Training Act Programs. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation-Draper Correctional Center, 1972.

Guidelines for the Administration and Implementation of the Federal City College, Lorton Extension College. District of Columbia, Department of Corrections, 1972

Harris, L. "Changing Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Corrections". Federal Probation, December, 1968, pp. 9-16.

Heggen, J. R., and Irvine, Fleet. A Study of Factors that May Influence the Implementation of a Vocational Education Curriculum at the Utah State Industrial School. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Research Coordination Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, 1967.

Hitt, William, and others. Final Report on an Analysis of the Education and Training Systems at Milan, Michigan and Terre Haute, Indiana to Federal Prison Industries Incorporated, United States Department of Justice. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Memorial Institute-Columbus Laboratories, 1968.

Hoffa, J. M. "Criminal Justice from the Inside". Judicature, May, 1973, pp. 422-426.

Hoffman, Hy, and Pagano, Tules. A New Conceptual Model for Adult Basic Education Staff Training with Application to Corrections, New Careers and Migrant Education. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the United States of America, 1971.

Hovey, M. "Forgotten Offenders". Manpower, January, 1971, pp. 38-41.

Hudson, J. B. Evaluation of Manpower Development Training Act in Correctional Institutions, Volume 1, Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation. Abt Association, 1971.

Huff, R. A., and Andre, C. R. Differential Education Model for I-3 Manipulators and I-3 Cultural Conformers. Funded by the California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973.

Hunt, J. W., and Bowers, J. E. Laws, Licenses and the Offender's Right to Work--A Study of State Laws Restricting the Occupational Licensing of Former Offenders. American Bar Association, 1973.

Hyde, L. M. Offender as an Educational Resource in Criminal Justice and Corrections. National College of State Trial Judges, 1970.

Inmate Rehabilitation Program Study. Technical Development Corporation, 1971.

International Halfway House Association. Guidelines and Standards for Halfway Houses and Community Treatment Centers. Cincinnati, Ohio: International Halfway House Association, 1973.

Invisible Prison--An Analysis of Barriers to Inmate Training and Post-Release Employment in New York and Maine. New York, New York: RCA Institutes, 1972.

Jackson, K. "Friend in Need". Federal Probation, September, 1971, pp. 44-45.

Jacobs, A., and Adams, S. District of Columbia--Educational Program of the District of Columbia Jail--Analysis and Recommendations. Funded by District of Columbia Department of Corrections, 1971.

Jeffery, C. Ray. Development of a Program to Prepare Delinquents, Disadvantaged Youths, and Slow Learners for Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: Washington School of Psychiatry, 1967.

Jenkins, W. O., and others. Post-Prison Analysis of Criminal Behavior and Longitudinal Follow-up Evaluation of Institutional Treatment. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, 1974.

Johnson, J. A. Role of Correctional Officers in the Institutional College Program. Presented at American Correctional Association Annual Convention, William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: American Correctional Association, 1972.

Johnson, Roosevelt. Black Agenda for Career Education. Washington, D.C.: Educational Community Counselors Associates Publications, Incorporated, 1974.

Johnson, S. L., and McCubbin, E. B. Taking Corrections into the Community--A Way to Begin. North Carolina: Institute of Human Ecology, 1971.

Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. A Time to Act--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower, 1969.

Justice, Department of. Education and Training in Correctional Institutions--Proceedings of a Conference. Washington, D.C.: Federal Prisons Industries, Incorporated, 1968.

Keyes, D., and Robinson, S. "Inmate Vocational Training--A National Overview". Correctional Education, Spring, 1973, pp. 15-24.

Keyes, David, and others. A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training: The First National Sourcebook. Newton, Massachusetts: New England Resource Center for Occupational Education, 1973.

Killinger, G. G., and Cromwell, Jr., P. F. Corrections in the Community--Alternatives to Imprisonment--Selected Readings. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1974.

Killinger, G. G., and Cromwell, P. F. Penology--The Evolution of Corrections in America. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1973.

King, Gordon A., and Regan, Timothy F. System for Inter-Agency Coordination in Adult Education. Washington, D.C.: 1969.

Larke, Jerry. Rehabilitating the Criminal Offender: Perspectives on the Success and Failure of Correctional Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Research and Practice Review, Summer, 1972.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Correctional Planning and Resource Guide. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1969

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Strategies for Meeting Correctional Training and Manpower Needs--Four Developmental Projects. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1968.

Legal Challenge to Corrections: Implications for Manpower and Training--Summary Correctional Briefing 11. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower Training, 1969.

Liechenstein, M. I. Employment Problems of the Ex-Offender--Testimony Before the City of New York Commission on Human Rights. New York City, New York: Rand Institute, 1972.

Lincoln, J. H. "Recommendation for True Prison Reform". Juvenile Court Journal, Fall, 1971, pp. 50-52.

Lipton, Douglas, Martinson, Robert, and Wilks, Judith. The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment--A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. New York City, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Mahan, J. A. Towards the Development of a Model for Implementation of a Differential Education Project. Funded by California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973.

Mandell, Wallace, and Sullivan, C. E. Restoration of Youth Through Training--A Final Report. Staten Island, New York: Wakoff Restoration Center, 1967.

Mardell, E. A. Curriculum Guide: Life Skills Course for Corrections. Prince Albert, Canada: Saskatchewan Newstart, 1972.

Margolin, Reuben J., and others. Curriculum Materials Developed From a Conference of Effective Approaches to the Rehabilitation of the Disabled Public Offender. Boston, Massachusetts: Northeastern University, 1966.

Marshall, P. "Pathfinding Behind Bars". Manpower, January, 1971, pp. 20-25.

Maryland--Job Placement Program--Final Report, First Year. Maryland Division of Corrections, 1972.

Massachusetts State Labor Council. The Role of Organized Labor in the Vocational Training and Placement of Hard-Core Youth. Boston, Massachusetts: Community Service Activities, n.d.

McCollum, S. G. "New Designs for Correctional Education and Training Programs". Federal Probation, June, 1973, pp. 6-11.

McCollum, S. G. "Potential of New Educational Delivery Systems for Correctional Treatment". Correctional Education, Spring, 1973, pp. 31-38.

McCollum, Sylvia. Potential of New Educational Delivery Systems for Correctional Treatment: A Correctional Education Handbook. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, 1973.

McCuen, G. E. America's Prisons--Correctional Institutions or Universities of Crime. Anoka, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, 1971.

McDonnell, John C. An Evaluation of the Training Provided in Correctional Institutions under Manpower Development Training Act, Section 251. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates, Incorporated, 1971.

McGee, R. A. "Idle Hands in the Devil's Workshop Prison Industries Must Produce More Than Busy Work or Profit". Manpower, January, 1971, pp. 32-37.

McKee, J. M. "Contingency Management in a Correctional Institution". Educational Technology, 1971, pp. 51-54.

McKee, J. M. Dramatic Applications of Educational Technology in Corrections. Carbondale, Illinois: Annual Conference on Correctional Education, 1967.

McKee, J. M. New Directions in Corrections. Address to October, 1971, Conference of the Hawaiian Corrections Association. Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1972.

McKee, J. M. Use of Contingency Management to Affect Learning Performance in Adult Institutionalized Offenders, 1971, p. 14. Presented at September, 1971, meeting in Washington, D.C. of the American Psychological Association.

McKee, J. M. Use of Programmed Instruction in Correctional Institutions. Presented at American Psychological Association, September, 1971, meeting. Funded by Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1970.

McMahon, Ernest E. Needs--of People and Their Communities--and the Adult Education: A Review of the Literature of Need Determinations. Syracuse University: Adult Education Association of the United States of America, 1970.

McNickle, Roma K., editor. Implications of Cultural Differences for Corrections. Washington, D.C.: 1967.

MDTA (Manpower Development Training Act) Experimental and Demonstration Findings no. 3, Manpower Development and Training in Correctional Programs. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, 1969.

Michigan--Department of Corrections--Use of Correctional Trade Training, A Study. Michigan Department of Corrections, 1969.

Milan, M. A., Wood, L. F., Williams, R. L., Rogers, J. G., and Hampton, L. R. Applied Behavior Analysis and the Imprisoned Adult Felon. Project I: The Cell Block Token Economy. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, 1974.

Miller, Herbert S. The Closed Door: The Effect of a Criminal Record on Employment with State and Local Public Agencies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1972.

Miller, M. J. "Vocational Training in Prisons--Some Social Policy Implications". Federal Probation, September, 1972, pp. 19-21.

Model Assessment and Classification System for Men and Women in Correctional Institutions, A. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Manpower Administration, 1974.

Murray, F. M. State Employment Counselor in a Correctional Setting: Paper presented at American Correctional Association, Cincinnati, Ohio: 1970.

National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Adult Education Annual Report, National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1972.

National Workshop of Corrections and Parole Adminstration, Proceedings. American Correctional Association, 1972.

Neal, L. L. "Manpower Needs in the Correctional Field". Therapeutic Recreation Journal, Third Quarter, 1972, pp. 125-133.

Neff, Donald Richard. Vocational Education in State and Federal Adult Correctional Institutions in the United States. Columbus, Ohio: 1972.

Newgate Model. Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972.

Nichols, Jack D. A Selected Bibliography on Training in Correctional Institutions with Annotations Developed for a Partial List of this Bibliography. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Vocational Education Research Coordinating Unit, 1969.

Nichols, Jack D. A Study of Arkansas Prison Inmates Concerning Occupational Training. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Research Coordination Unit for Occupational Education, 1970.

Offenders as a Correctional Manpower Resource, Summary--Correctional Briefings no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Ohio Legislative Service Commission. Ohio's Adult Corrections System--Report no. RR 105. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Legislative Service Commission, 1971.

Ohio State Department of Mental Hygiene and Corrections. Rehabilitation Education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Department of Education, n.d.

Ohlin, L. E. Prisoners in America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973.

Oklahoma State Penitentiary. Vocational Rehabilitation Services in a State Penitentiary. Washington, D.C.: Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. 1967.

Opening Doors Through Educational Programs for Institutionalized Delinquents. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1967.

Operation Restore (Rehabilitation and Education of Selected, Trainable Offenders Returned to Employment). xeroxed copy. Kentucky Department of Corrections, n.d.

Papers and Reports of the Annual Correctional Education Conference (17th). Carbondale, Illinois: 1968.

Peters, John Marshall. Effect of Internal-External Control on Learning and Participation in Occupational Education. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University, 1968.

Phelps, William R. Vocational Rehabilitation Operations Within a Prison System: One Approach to Serving the Mentally Retarded Offender, n.d.

Phillips, C. W. Developing Correctional Manpower. Paper presented to the 13th Annual Institute on Crime and Delinquency in Dallas. Dallas, Texas: Funded by Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1968.

Piontkovsky, Roman. Humanistic Education through Community Development. Paper at the Annual Conference of the Commission on Adult Basic Education of Adult Education Association (11th). Palm Beach, Florida: 1973.

Pittsburgh Federal Offenders' Rehabilitation Project--Final Report. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Pennsylvania State Department of Labor and Industry, 196?.

Pownall, George A. Employment Problems of Released Prisoners. College Park, Maryland: Maryland University, 1969.

Project Model: First Annual Report. Massachusetts: Funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973.

Project Pride (Prescribed Reinforcement Involving Differentiated Education). An Experimental Project. Ashland, Kentucky: Federal Youth Center, 1970.

Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, The. Summary Correctional Briefings no. 2. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Reeks, L. S. "Assisting Parolees in Obtaining Jobs". California Youth Authority Quarterly, Winter, 1973, pp. 24-28.

Rehabilitating Institutionalized Delinquents and Retardates. Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia, Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1970.

Rehabilitation Research Foundation. Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections: Phase II--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Funded by Manpower Administration, 1971.

Rehabilitation Research Foundation. Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections: Phase III. Washington, D.C.: Funded by Manpower Administration, 1973.

Rehabilitation Research Foundation. Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections: Project Report on Phase V. Montgomery, Alabama: Funded by Rehabilitation Resource Foundation, 1974.

Report of the National Seminar: Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions. Held at New Brunswick, New Jersey: 1968.

Research in Correctional Rehabilitation--Summary Corrections Briefings no. 8. Washington, D.C.: 1967.

Residential Center: Corrections in the Community, The. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Prisons, 1970.

Review of Manpower Research and Development Projects in the Correctional Field (1963-1973). Washington, D.C.: Criminal Justice Research, 1973.

Riskin, L. L. "Removing Impediments to Employment of Work-Release Prisoners". Criminal Law Bulletin, November, 1972, pp. 761-774.

Roanoke Valley, Virginia--Regional Corrections Program. Hellmuth, Obata, and Kassabaum, 1972.

Roberts, A. R. Correctional Treatment of the Offender. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Roberts, A. R. "New Delivery System for Post-Secondary Education of the Offender". Correctional Education, Spring, 1973, pp. 3-14.

Roberts, A. R. Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Roberts, A. R. Sourcebook on Prison Education--Past, Present, and Future. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Robertson, Von H. A Descriptive Analysis of Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Programs and Techniques at the Utah State Prison. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Board of Education, 1968.

Role of Organized Labor in the Vocational Training and Placement of Hard-Core Youth, The. Eric Documents Reproduction Services, n.d.

Ross, A. M. "Continuing Education". Higher Education, May, 1973, pp. 175-199.

Rovner-Pieczenik, Roberta. The First Decade of Experience: A Synthesis of Manpower Research and Development Projects in Criminal Justice and Corrections. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Criminal Justice Research, Incorporated, 1973.

Rush, Ralph A. Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions. Washington, D.C.: Funded by the Office of Education, Bureau of Research, n.d.

Ryan, T. A., and Silvern, L. C. Goals of Adult Basic Education in Corrections. Honolulu, Hawaii: Hawaii University, 1970.

Ryan T. A. Career Education in Corrections--Proceedings of a National Work Conference conducted by the University of Hawaii, Chicago, Illinois, October 25-28, 1972. Honolulu, Hawaii: Hawaii University, 1972.

Ryan T. Antoinette. Systems Research in Career Education in Corrections. Chicago, Illinois: American Education Research Association, 1974.

Saipe, A. L. "Federal Prison Industries--A Survey of Private Senior Executives' Attitudes". Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, January, 1973, pp. 74-82.

Sard, T. R. "Contact with the Free Community is Basic if Institutional Programs are to Succeed". Federal Probation, March, 1967, pp. 3-8.

Scott, E. M., and Scott, K. L. Criminal Rehabilitation--Within and Without the Walls. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Seay, D. M. Roles of the Teachers for the Effective Use of Programmed Instruction in a Correctional Setting. Funded by Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1968.

Seay, D. M. Roles of the Teachers in Selecting, Counseling, Assessing, and Placing Youthful Offenders in Vocational Training Programs. Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1968.

Shrock, Charles E. Modular Instruction Welding--Vocational Training. Petersburg, Virginia: Federal Reformatory, 1971.

Sinclair, Ward, and Moulden, W. E. Educating Prisoners for Socially Constructive Roles. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974.

Singer, N. M. "Incentives and the Use of Prison Labor". Crime and Delinquency, April, 1973, pp. 200-211.

Singer, N. M. Value of Adult Inmate Manpower. American Bar Association, Correctional Economic Analysis Series, 1973.

Sloan, Alfred P. Manpower Policies and the Disadvantaged: A Summary Report on Labor Market Information Systems and the Disadvantaged. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, n.d.

Smith, R. R., McKee, J. M., and Milan, M. A. A Survey of the Study--Release Policies of American Correctional Agencies. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, 1974.

Social Science Research, Bureau of. The Financial Resources of Released Prisoners. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1974.

Spencer, C., and Berecochea, J. E. California Institution for Women--Vocational Training--and Evaluation. California Department of Corrections, 1971.

Stracensky, Gary C., and others. Texas Jails--Problems and Reformation. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University; Texas Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, 1970.

Strategies for Meeting Correctional Training and Manpower Needs--Four Developmental Projects. Eric Documents Reproduction Services, 1968.

Stratton, John R., and West, Jude P. The Role of Correctional Industries. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.

Studt, E., and Russell, B. Staff Training for Personnel in Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents--Report of a Workshop. Washington, D.C.: Health, Education and Welfare, 1958.

Sullivan, Clyde E , and Mendell, Wallace. Restoration of Youth through Training. Staten Island, New York: Wakoff Research Center, 1967.

Sultan, Paul, and Ehmann, G. E. The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender. New York City, New York: National Council of Christians, 1970.

Summary of Proceedings of a Workshop (Carnegie International Center). New York, New York: Eric Documents Reproduction Services, June, 1969.

Swanson, Richard. Work Release: Toward an Understanding of the Law, Policy, and Operation of Community-Based State Corrections. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University, 1973.

Switzer, M. E. "Vocational Rehabilitation and Corrections--A Promising Partnership". Federal Probation, September, 1967, pp. 12-17.

Systems and Research, Incorporated. An Integrated Planning Paper on Problems, Objectives, and Strategies for the Social Service Delivery System in Lansing, Michigan. Washington, D.C.: Social and Rehabilitation Service, 1974.

Taggart, III, R. Prison of Unemployment--Manpower Programs for Offenders. Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972.

Tallant, Kyle M. Tampa Federal Offender Rehabilitation--Final Report. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Department of Education, 1969.

Targets for In-Service Training. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1967.

Time to Act, A--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Tompkins, D. C. Prison and the Prisoner, Public Policy Bibliographies. California: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1972.

Tonkowicz, Edward J. Project Yippee at the H. C. Wilcox Technical School--Final Report. Meridian, Connecticut: Wilcox Technical School, 1972.

Torrence, John T. Vocational Training Offered by State and Federal Correctional Institutions. Leavenworth, Kansas: United States Penitentiary, 1966.

Torrence, John Thomas. Relationship Between Training Programs being Offered in State and Federal Penal Institutions and Unfilled Job Openings. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1967.

Training and Placement of the Youthful Inmates of Draper Correctional Center--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Agency, 1971.

United States Congress, Select Commission on Crime. Reform of Our Correctional System--A Report by the Select Committee on Crime. United States Congress, 1973.

University and Corrections: Potential for Collaborative Relationships, The. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Van Groningen, J., and Andre, C. R. Differential Education Model for I-4 Neurotic Acting-Out Students. California Department of Youth Authority, 1973.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services in a State Penitentiary System: Final Report. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State Penitentiary, 1967.

Walker, Gary. The Pioneer Messenger Service. New York, New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 1972.

Washington, State of Joint Committee on Education. Education Programs in Penal and Correctional Institutions: A Report by the Subcommittee on Occupational, Adult and Institutional Education. Olympia, Washington: 1971.

Waters, J. P. Connecticut--Annual Report of Community Release Programs for Period Ending June 30, 1972. Connecticut Department of Corrections, 1972.

Wenk, E. A., and Frank, C. "Some Progress in the Evaluation of Institutional Programs". Federal, September, 1973, pp. 30-32.

West, J. P., and Stratton, J. R. Role of Correctional Industries. Iowa City, Iowa: Iowa University, 1971.

Whitson, Charles, Waldron, Ronald, Monroe, William E., Smith, Charles L., and Robinson, Ronald. Cooperative Follow-Up Project of the Windham School District and the Texas Department of Corrections. Huntsville, Texas: Windham School District, 1975.

Whitson, Charles, Monroe, William E., Clark, Charles L., and Smith, Charles L. Vocational Follow-Up Project of the Windham School District in the Texas Department of Corrections. Huntsville, Texas: Windham School District, 1974.

Wicks, R. J. Correctional Psychology--Themes and Problems in Correcting the Offender. New York City, New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Wilkinson, Fred T. Guide to Inmate Education. Jefferson City, Missouri: Missouri State Department of Corrections, 1965.

Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections. Objective Writing and Teaching Fundamentals for Windham Vocational Teachers. Huntsville, Texas: Vocational Media Center, 1974.

Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections. The Reality Adjustment Program. Huntsville, Texas: Vocational Media Center, 1974.

Wirtz, W. Willard. Report of the Secretary of Labor on Manpower Research and Training Under the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962. Washington, D.C.: Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research, 1966.

Wisconsin Division of Corrections. Work Release--Study Release Program, Calendar Years, 1971-1972. Funded by Wisconsin Division of Corrections, 1973.

Witt, L. R. Project Develop--Developing Educational Vocational Experiences for Long Term Occupational Adjustment of Parolees. Funded b· New York Division of Parole; Labor Department, n.d.

Wood, Larry F., and Jenkins, W. O. Imprisoned Resources--Innovative Techniques in Educating Prison Inmates. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1971.

Zivan, Morton. Youth in Trouble, A Vocational Approach. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Research and Demonstration Project; The Children's Village, 1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ADDENDUM

Adams, Stuart. "Higher Learning Behind Bars". Change, November, 1973, p. 46.

Baker, Richard J., and Sawyer, Horace W. Guidelines for the Development of Adjustment Services in Rehabilitation. ERIC Current Awareness Service, 1971.

Barnwell, Richard R. Derivation and Initial Assessment of a Model Vocational Education Program for New York State Correctional Facilities. Unpublished dissertation.

Bregman, Ralph. Report of Study on Vocational Programs in Selected California Institutions for Male Felons. Sacramento, California: California Dept. of Corrections, Education Services, 1975.

Cole, Jr., Robert W. "Apprenticeship is the Answer". Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 56, Number 9, pp. 601-604.

Corrections Clearinghouse. Annual Descriptive Report. Washington State: Commission for Vocational Education, 1975.

Cronin, F. Patrick. "Recent Trends Toward Transitional Educational Opportunities for the Adult Public Offender". Adult Leadership, Volume 23, Number 12, pp. 355-357.

Cronin, F. Patrick, Abram, Robert E., Reinhart, Bruce, Whitson, Charles. Improvement of Occupational Education in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Phase I. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, February, 1976.

Cronin, F. Patrick, and others. Rehabilitation Education. Columbus, Ohio: Division of Vocational Education, n.d.

Dell'Apa, Frank. Issues in Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1973.

Feldman, Sylvia D. Trends in Offender Vocational and Education Programs: A Literature Search with Program Development Guidelines. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.

Foster, J. P. Manpower Development in Criminal Justice System; Proceedings of the Southern Conference on Corrections. Volume 20, Number EB2, p. 114.

From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender. D.C. Commission on the Status of Women, 14th & E Streets, Washington, D.C. 20004, n.d. (monograph).

Governor's Task Force on Corrections (Maine). In the Public Interest: Report on the Governor's Task Force on Corrections. Portland, Maine: Human Services Development Institute, University of Maine, 1974.

Group Opportunity Program: Summary Report. Wahpeton, North Dakota: North Dakota State School of Science, 1974-1975.

Gubbins, Edmund J. "Developing Career Education in an Adult Corrections Program". Adult Leadership, Volume 23, Number 12, pp. 365-366.

Hall, Jackie L. "Institutional Learning is not Institutionalized at the Vienna Correctional Conter: Preceptions of a Teacher Intern". Illinois Career Education Journal, Volume 23, Number 2, pp. 27-28.

Hitt, William D., and Agostino, Norman P. Final Report: The Development of a Model Education and Training System for Inmates in Federal Correctional Institutions. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Memorial Institute, 1968.

Korim, Andrew S. Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Kraushaar, Jack. "Vienna Manpower Brief". Illinois Career Education Journal, Volume 32, Number 2, p. 29.

LeDonne, Marjorie. Summary of Court Decisions Relating to the Provision of Library Services in Correctional Institutions. (California University: Berkeley). Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1973.

Levy, Girard W., Abram, Robert A., and LaDow, Diane. Vocational Preparation in U. S. Correctional Institutions: A 1974 Survey. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Memorial Institute, December, 1975.

MacCormick, A. H. The Education of Adult Prisoners. New York: National Study for Penal Information, 1971.

MacCormick, A. H. "Resume of Progress in Correctional Education". Correctional Education Today. New York: American Correctional Association, p. 17.

Marsh, John J. "Higher Education in American Prisons". Crime and Delinquency Literature, March, 1973, p. 143.

Morris, Norval. The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Muth, Edmund H. and the Law Offender's Planning Task Force of the Governor's Advisory Council on Manpower (Illinois). Report on the Manpower Needs of the Law Offender in Illinois. Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, 1974.

North, David S. "Women Offenders: Breaking the Training Mold". Manpower, Volume 7, Number 2, pp. 13-19.

Operation Restore. Frankfort, Kentucky: In Press, 1975.

Review. Charleston, West Virginia: Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, n.d.

Salmony, Lawrence D. Corrections Education in Oregon: A Way to Proceed, a report to the State Corrections Education Commission. ERIC Current Awareness Service, 1974.

Sienko, Dennis, and Sondegroth, Leo. "Can Incarcerated Kids Labeled 'Delinquents' and 'School Failures' Operate Successfully in a Community College Setting?" Illinois Career Education Journal, Volume 32, Number 2, pp. 24-26.

"Survey of Funds Encumbered or Expended in Fiscal Year 1973 under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended for Programs Serving Persons in Adult and Juvenile Correctional Institutions". Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, 1975.

Vocational Assessment Systems: Application in Programs Serving Special Needs Populations. ERIC Current Awareness Service, 1973.

Wooley, William, coordinator. Florida View, Capsule Summary. Chipley, Florida: Florida View Center at the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, 1974.